LIBRARY OF
Union Biblical Seminary

Presented by

Purchased by

296
B45

Feb. 15, 22

REVIEW COPY

The price of this book

is $1.00 net ; postage .....

Kindly mail copy of paper containing review to

THE GRIFFITH & ROWLAND PRESS

1701-1703 CHESTNUT STREET

PHILADELPHIA

The Old Testament
among
The Semitic Religions

The Old Testament
among
The Semitic Religions

By
George Ricker Berry, Ph. D., D. D.
Professor of Semitic Languages, Colgate University

BS
180
B3779
910

LIBRARY OF
Panebrake Theological Seminary
11,543
299.2
B534o
c.1

Philadelphia
The Griffith & Rowland Press
Boston Chicago St. Louis

To
the memory of
C. L. B.

Copyright 1910 by
A. J. ROWLAND, Secretary

Published March, 1910

Preface

WITHIN recent years much has been written concerning the relation of the Hebrews to the surrounding nations, especially Babylonia and Assyria. While many phases of this relation have been discussed with great fulness, the most fundamental question has received a relatively inadequate consideration. This general question is, What features of the religious teachings, or theology, of the Old Testament are to be considered common to the Hebrews and some other nation or nations, and what features are distinctive. Various elements in this question have been discussed, but it has been approached usually from the other side, with the consideration, *e. g.*, of the features which Babylonia has contributed to the Old Testament. It is this general question which the present writer proposes for consideration.

The nations to be embraced in this discussion evidently should include all the Semitic nations,

so far as material is available; for the association of the Hebrews was largely with Semitic nations. Further, it is a question not alone of national environment but of national inheritance. Some reference will also be made to the religion of Egypt. It is held by some that the Egyptians were a Semitic people. The present writer does not accept this view, but recognizes that the Egyptians were frequently subject to Semitic influences—religious as well as other—from an early period. The Egyptian sojourn of the Hebrews, however, and the intercourse between the two nations during the subsequent history, indicate that there was opportunity for influence by one nation upon the other. Nevertheless, the general study which the writer has given to the matter has convinced him that any such influence was comparatively slight. Hence, it does not seem important to make any extended comparison with the Egyptian religion, but preferable to limit such comparison to a few points of special importance. No reference is made to possible influence upon the Old Testament teaching by the Persian religion, the religion of Zarathushtra. If there was such influence, as

seems probable, it included only a few points and embraced simply details, so that it may here be disregarded. Practically, then, the comparison is between the Old Testament and the other Semitic religions.

So far as a common-Semitic element appears from this study, or even an element common to the Hebrews and one or more of the other Semitic nations, it may, aside from the possibility of independent development, be explanied in two principal ways. One is by influence of one nation upon another, either by definite borrowing or in a less specific way; the other is by inheritance from common ancestors. Some reference will inevitably be made to these possibilities in the course of the discussion, but the general matter will be considered more directly at its conclusion.

It is recognized, of course, that any results reached in this study must be provisional and held with all due reserve. That is a necessary result from the fragmentary nature of the material. The new evidence that is constantly being made available, especially in the Babylonian field, will inevitably modify many features as they now ap-

pear. At the same time, the material now available is sufficient so that some, at least provisional, results can be reached; and it is not probable that all results now attained can be radically changed by increase of knowledge. An attempt to formulate conclusions cannot wait indefinitely for advancing knowledge, otherwise no conclusions could be reached in any field.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY, January 1, 1910. G. R. B.

Contents

PART I. GENERAL SURVEY

Chapter		Page
I.	Sketch of Semitic History	13
II.	Semitic Religious Literature	19
III.	Preliminary Problems	28

PART II. DIVINE BEINGS

I.	The Divine Nature	35
II.	Metaphysical Attributes	57
III.	Moral Attributes	70

PART III. MAN

I.	Sin	87
II.	Salvation through Sacrifice	99
III.	Salvation through Incantation	142
IV.	Salvation in Other Ways	146

PART IV. THE FUTURE LIFE

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE GENERAL CONCEPTION 165

II. REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS 173

PART V. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS 185

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 203

PART I

GENERAL SURVEY

I

SKETCH OF SEMITIC HISTORY

CONCERNING the cradle of the Semites in any absolute sense, it is impossible to speak with assurance. That involves the general question of the origin and distribution of man upon earth, and goes back into prehistoric times. Concerning the common distributing point of the Semitic races, however, the home in which they lived in early times as one people, there are some definite indications. This common home is generally considered to have been Arabia. It is hardly necessary to discuss the question here: it is sufficient to say that in the judgment of the writer the indications point clearly to this conclusion.[1] This early home is to be sought in Central Arabia, the natural abiding-place of the nomads, rather than in the extreme north or south. From this early home came successive migratory movements toward the north, resulting chiefly from

[1] Concerning this and other points in the general sketch here given, reference may be made to the article by the writer, "Semitic Nations," in the "Encyclopedia Americana," Vol. XIV.

over-population. The first of these was the Babylonian migration. Even the approximate date of this cannot be determined with any approach to certainty. Winckler assigns an interval of about a thousand years between the principal migrations, and makes the date of this one about 3400 B. C. But most authorities would consider it many centuries earlier than this, and Winckler allows the possibility of a considerable portion of the movement being earlier.[1] The next wave of migration was the Canaanite. From this came the people of Canaan, Phœnicia, and vicinity, including the Hebrews as one of the later representatives of the movement. The date of this migration as given by Winckler, 2400-2100 B. C., may be accepted as approximately correct. For the next movement, the Aramaic, Winckler gives the dates from the fifteenth to the thirteenth century. The culmination of this movement, however, should perhaps be regarded as later than these dates. The Aramaic tribes spread over Mesopotamia and Syria, and to some extent also over portions of Babylonia and Assyria. The last wave was the Arabian, the movement of the Arabs into Syria, in the seventh or eighth century B. C.

[1] See "The History of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 21f.

In all the cases cited the movement is not limited to the dates above given, but was in force both before and after, these dates indicating no more than the crest of the wave. Along with these came a southern migration, that of nomadic Arabs into Southern Arabia, where they adopted a settled habit of life. This apparently coincided approximately with that of the Arameans, or may have been somewhat earlier.

From the Babylonian migration resulted the Babylonian people and empire. The Babylonians as a nation had a distinct history until their conquest by Cyrus, in 538 B. C., after which they never again regained their separate national existence. To an unusual extent the Babylonians absorbed foreign elements, for the most part non-Semitic. In their early history they were probably mingled with the Sumerians, their predecessors in the land. At later times conquest by the Elamites and Cassites caused further admixture. The Chaldeans who ruled in the new Babylonian empire were doubtless a later wave of Semitic migration, perhaps allied to the Arameans; and many Arameans settled at various times in Babylonia and were to some extent absorbed. A daughter State of Babylonia was Assyria, founded

by emigrants from Babylonia before 2200 B. C., whose history continued to the fall of Nineveh in 606. Assyria had less of foreign admixture than Babylonia, at least until the later years of the empire.

The Canaanite nations, concerning which we have definite information, are Phœnicia, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Canaan, and the Hebrews. The earliest of these to reach the final location were the Phœnicians. The first definite references to these are in the Egyptian records at about the sixteenth century, but their coming was doubtless much earlier than that. The other nations may have come to the West at about the same time as the Hebrews, or perhaps somewhat earlier than that. The Old Testament accounts indicate at least that these nations were closely connected with the Hebrews. All these nations of Canaan and vicinity continued to occupy positions of considerable prominence down to the later pre-Christian centuries.

The Arameans grouped themselves less definitely into nations than the people in these earlier movements. They were for the most part tribes rather than nations, and preserved their nomadic habits for a considerable period of time, in most

cases for centuries. They occupied Mesopotamia and, later, Syria, together with portions of Babylonia and Assyria. When they gave up their nomadic form of life their government was loosely organized. The city-State was a specially prominent feature in their organization. These city-States were found in Mesopotamia and Syria, the strongest being in Syria. The political power of the Arameans was broken by the Assyrian conquests, which culminated in the capture of Damascus by Tiglathpileser III, about 732 B. C. They continued, however, to be the prominent element in the population of Syria and upper Mesopotamia for centuries after this event.

The Arabs retained their tribal organization and nomadic form of life, except the southern branch, during all their ancient history, and even largely to the present day.

Further mention should also be made of the southern division of the Arabs. Southern Arabia being fertile and adapted to agriculture, a settled mode of life was naturally adopted. Four tribes or nations developed here—the Minæans, the Sabæans, the people of Hadramaut, and the people of Kataban. The Minæans and Sabæans established kingdoms of considerable strength. The

history of this region is known but very imperfectly as yet; the present tendency, however, seems to be toward the view that the Minæan kingdom extended from about 1250-600 B. C., and the Sabæan from about 750-115 B. C.[1] The kingdom of Aksum, in Abyssinia, the inhabitants of which spoke the language commonly called Ethiopic, was founded by emigrants from Southern Arabia, Sabæans, about A. D. 350.

[1] These are the dates given by Barton, "A Sketch of Semitic Origins," p. 122.

II

SEMITIC RELIGIOUS LITERATURE

THE religious literature of the Babylonians and Assyrians is almost entirely of Babylonian origin; when the particular inscription found was actually written in Assyria it is usually a copy of a Babylonian original. A large part of the religious documents are actually from the library of the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal; but the originals were undoubtedly much older, although in most cases it is impossible to fix the date even approximately. Evidently they were of various dates, being produced at different times during the course of Babylonian history; but the specifically religious documents are thought to be relatively ancient. It is impossible to fix any order in the production of the different kinds of literature, unless by conjecture. Of some of the documents several copies have been found with considerable variations. The cities prominent as religious centers were naturally the place of composition of most of these religious documents, but

some have been changed to adapt them to the worship of a different god from the one in whose honor they were composed.

Of course religious elements are found in most of the Babylonian and Assyrian literature; and some information concerning religious matters is derived from inscriptions which are not specifically religious. In the narrow sense, however, it is probably sufficient to divide the religious literature into the following five classes: (1), the magical texts and rituals; (2), the hymns, prayers, and psalms; (3), omens; (4), cosmological texts; and (5), epics and myths.[1] The magical texts consist of formulæ and directions for securing protection against the demons and evil spirits who injure men. There are several prominent series of these, one called prayers of the lifting of the hand, and others named *Maqlu, Shurpu, Labartu, Utukki limnuti,* etc. *Maqlu* and *Shurpu* both mean burning, as a symbolical act in the incantations; *Labartu* is the name of a special demon; while *Utukki limnuti* means evil demons. These magical texts were for use in the temple by the priests, and thus in a broad sense belonged to

[1] See especially Jastrow, "*Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*," I, p. 269; and Weber, "*Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer*," pp. 40-198.

the temple ritual. Other texts, however, known more specifically as ritual texts, are those which give directions to the priests for the performance of their specific ceremonies.[1] They give directions for three classes of priests, the *baru,* soothsayer; *ashipu,* exorcist; and *zammaru,* singer.

The three varieties of literature classified above as hymns, prayers, and psalms are not sharply distinguished, being often found as parts of the same composition, and running into each other. In general, however, it is meant that a hymn is a poem in praise of a deity; a prayer is a petition for help; and a psalm is an expression of feeling, especially of the various needs of which the writer is conscious. Of the last, some are known as penitential psalms, confession of sin being prominent. Regularly these hymns, prayers, and psalms are a part of the temple services, although many of them may have been composed originally as the expression of personal feeling.

The omen literature is very abundant. By omen texts are meant any inscriptions which have to do with the communication to men of the divine will by means of any signs or indications.

[1] The transliterations and translations of several of these texts are found in Zimmern, "*Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion.*"

Of course these deal in general with the future, the ascertaining of what is to take place. A separate division might be recognized as oracles, which are, however, closely connected with omens. In the oracles specific questions were addressed to a god, and the god responded, either through the mouth of a priest, or more frequently a priestess, or through some sign, particularly through the condition of the animal sacrificed in connection with the ceremony, the special seat of this oracular response being the liver. The most of these texts thus far found are addressed to the sun-god Shamash, and belong to the time of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal. The omen texts derive omens from earthly and heavenly events. Among these earthly events are any occurrences that are at all unusual. Here belong the actions of animals, unusual births among animals and men, dreams, also soothsaying from sacrifices, and from cups, etc. For the most part such omens pertained to the king or to the general welfare. But there were also omens from individual experiences, which affected the individual alone. The heavenly events were the changes of the heavenly bodies, which were of course continually giving omens. This is the psuedo-science of as-

trology, which was fully developed and of great importance.

The cosmology is not sharply distinguished from the myths; since there is much that is mythical in what are called distinctly the cosmological tablets, and cosmological elements are found in some tablets that are more especially mythical. As usually classified, however, by the cosmological texts those tablets are meant that deal somewhat directly with the creation. The principal one of these is what is usually called the "creation epic," named also *enuma elish* from its first words. This consists of seven tablets, but is much mutilated. The most of the text at hand was found in the library of Ashurbanipal, but fragments have come from other sources. This is an account of the creation of all things—gods, the earth, animals, and men. Marduk is the prominent actor, and it is reasonably supposed that the present form was due to a recension in the interest of Marduk of Babylon when Babylon became the capital of Babylonia, about the time of Hammurabi, 2250 B. C. In that case Marduk has taken the place of some other god, or gods, as the principal actor. It is not the creation itself that is the chief purpose of the writing, but the account of

the victory of Marduk over Tiamat, the goddess of chaos. Of special interest is a small fragment, K3445+Rm 396, which clearly is a part of the fifth tablet, but which has the god Ashur in place of Marduk, it thus being a later, specifically Assyrian, recension. A distinct account is found in a new-Babylonian tablet from Eridu, 82-5-22, 1048. This forms the introduction to an incantation text, and consists of about forty lines. It varies considerably from the other account, especially in the fact that the gods are already in existence. The creator is Marduk, here apparently the earlier Marduk of Eridu. Small fragments of other accounts have also been found.

The epics and the myths, also, are not sharply distinguished. Usually, however, the term epic is applied especially to the epic of Gilgamesh. The most of this comes from the library of Ashurbanipal. It is the account of one Gilgamesh, whose name is written with the determinative for divine beings, but who in his acts is more human than divine. The narrative is for the most part mythical, with possibly a slight historical basis. There are twelve tablets in this epic. A part of it is the narrative of Utnapishtim giving an account of the deluge, usually called the deluge

tablet, and having close resemblances to the Old Testament account of the deluge. A fragment of another recension of this epic with marked variations has also been found, written in the time of Hammurabi; and there are various fragments of a different deluge account, in which the hero is not Utnapishtim but Atrahasis.

Among the myths more specifically so called are the Etana myth, which is an account of a mythical hero, Etana; the myth of Ira—Ira being the plague god; the myth of the storm god Zu; the myth of Adapa the Babylonian Adam; and several others.

The Phœnician literature is preserved in their own inscriptions and in some quotations in Greek and Latin authors. The oldest inscriptions are three very brief ones found on fragments of bowls in Cyprus, and considered to belong to the eighth century B. C.[1] Most of the inscriptions are from the fourth century and later. The religious element is prominent in these inscriptions. Of special importance, religiously, is the Marseilles tablet,[2] of about the fourth century B. C., found at Marseilles but probably inscribed at Carthage. This deals with sacrifices. Similar are two shorter

[1] CIS, I, 5. [2] CIS, I, 165.

inscriptions, one of which is badly broken, of about the same date, found at Carthage.[1]

There is no native literature known of the Ammonites, Edomites, and Canaanites. Some information concerning their religious ideas is derived from notices in the Old Testament and statements in the literature of other nations. This is supplemented in the case of the Canaanites by the results of recent excavations in Palestine.

The native Moabite literature consists of one inscription, the Moabite stone, written by Mesha, king of Moab, about 850 B. C. This gives some religious information, and is supplemented from other sources, particularly the Old Testament notices.

It is unnecessary to give here an account of the Hebrew literature found in the Old Testament.

The earliest Aramaic literature consists of three inscriptions found at Zenjirli, in Northern Syria, dating from the eighth century B. C. These are historical and religious. There are many later Aramaic inscriptions, of the sixth to the fourth century and later, found in Arabia, Egypt, and elsewhere, in which ordinarily there is a religious

[1] CIS, I, 166, 167.

element. The Christian Aramaic, *i. e.,* Syriac, literature has of course no information for the present purpose.

The Arabic literature of the time of Muhammad and later is of course too late to be included here. Information concerning the religion before Muhammad comes largely from the Nabatæan inscriptions, written in Aramaic by an Arabic people, with dates somewhat before and after the time of Christ, and from traditions given by later Arabic writers.[1]

Many inscriptions from Southern Arabia have been published in recent years, although a majority of those discovered remain as yet unpublished. These are of very uncertain date, although it is thought that some of them are as early as 1000 B. C. The inscriptions published are largely votive inscriptions. These afford much information concerning the gods, and some details concerning other features of the religion.

[1] See especially Wellhausen, "*Reste Arabischen Heidentums,*" 2d ed.

III

PRELIMINARY PROBLEMS

THERE is a question concerning the method of investigation and presentation which is this: How largely shall chronological matters enter into the discussion? In some specific cases quite largely, more often practically not at all. This is, in the first place, because chronological data are comparatively scanty. In the Old Testament the chronological development of the thought is somewhat in dispute, as is well known. But in the other Semitic nations the case is very much worse. In fact, in nearly all cases among these other nations it is impossible to trace the chronological development of the thought from any but the slightest indications. The difficulty is well illustrated by the fact that most of the Babylonian religious literature in existence is only known from the copies in the library of Ashurbanipal; that the composition of much was earlier than this is unanimously agreed, but how early there is very little, indeed, to indicate. Again,

for such a study as this it is often unimportant to trace the chronological development of the thought among the separate nations. Such a matter might be of considerable importance in relation to the specific question of borrowing. But otherwise it is often sufficient for the purpose of comparison to consider the sum of the teaching of each religion, or the result of the development in each nation, the highest point attained. In general, this highest point was reached in all these nations at periods of time not very remote from each other.

Another problem is the question of borrowing already mentioned. So far as it concerns the question of borrowing by or from the Old Testament, this will be treated somewhat in a specific way later. How far, however, was there borrowing by the different Semitic nations, one from another, aside from the Hebrews? The evidence is not at hand to answer this question very fully. There are suggestions of such borrowing: *e. g.*, when Shamash appears as a deity among the Arameans and elsewhere it looks like a borrowing from the Babylonians. Yet most of the deities of each nation seem clearly to have had an independent development. Their names largely dif-

fer, and their characteristics as well. Such borrowing as there has been, therefore, appears to be for the most part in minor matters. Of course it is quite within the possibilities that there is borrowing that cannot easily be traced, but it does not seem probable that there is a sufficient amount of this to affect materially any results that may be attained.

A similar question is how much borrowing there may have been by Semites from non-Semitic peoples with whom they were closely associated. This, it would seem, might be expected to be a more difficult matter to trace than that which has just been mentioned. As a matter of fact, there seems to be no good reason for supposing that much borrowing of this kind has obtained, unless it be in one particular case. It is thought by many that the Babylonians borrowed quite largely, in religion and in other things, from the Sumerians. Sayce,[1] *e. g.*, thinks that many elements of the Babylonian religion, especially animism, were borrowed from the Sumerians. The whole Sumerian question is far from being settled. That the Sumerians were a reality is a conclusion that may be considered generally accepted. But that

[1] "The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia," *passim.*

by no means tells the whole story. The extreme claims for Sumerian influence upon the Babylonians are being considerably modified. It may be regarded as reasonably certain that the Sumerians exerted no such great influence as is claimed by Sayce. In fact, the present tendency is to regard their actual influence as slight. Such matters as animism are found to some extent in the other Semitic religions. So far as the religion is concerned the following statements of Jastrow's may be considered fairly to represent the views of many: "It is generally admitted that all the literature of Babylonia, including the oldest, and even that written in the 'ideographic' style, whether we term it 'Sumero-Akkadian' or 'hieratic,' is the work of the Semitic settlers of Mesopotamia." "The culture, including the religion of Babylonia, is likewise a Semitic production, and since Assyria received its culture from Babylonia, the same remark holds good for entire Mesopotamia." "The important consideration for our purpose is, that the religious conceptions and practices as they are reflected in the literary sources now at our command are distinctly Babylonian. With this we may rest content, and, leaving theories aside, there will be no necessity in

an exposition of the religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians to differentiate or to attempt to differentiate between Semitic and so-called non-Semitic elements. Local conditions and the long period covered by the development and history of the religion in question, are the factors that suffice to account for the mixed and in many respects complicated phenomena which this religion presents." [1]

[1] "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 23f.

PART II

DIVINE BEINGS

I

THE DIVINE NATURE

IN theological discussions three things especially are included in treating of the divine nature—personality, unity, and spirituality. Before making a comparison on these points, a brief statement concerning the usual Semitic way of regarding divine beings may be desirable. It is perhaps extreme to regard animism as an early phase in all religions, yet it has been well established that it is a very common feature of primitive religions. It seems reasonably clear that this was the earliest stage that can be traced in the Semitic religions. By animism is meant that religious belief which ascribes life to all the objects and forces of nature, including not only those of earth and air, but also the heavenly bodies. Each object and force was thus the seat of a spirit; and, in the primitive conception, all these spirits were equal in power. Of this belief there are traces in several of the Semitic religions, although they are most marked among the Babylonians. But modi-

fications necessarily arose. A difference in the power of these spirits over human affairs was soon believed in. "The result of this would be to give a preponderance to the worship of the sun and moon and the water, and of such natural phenomena as rain, wind, and storms, with their accompaniment of thunder and lightning, as against the countless sprites believed to be lurking everywhere." [1] With the sun and moon were also associated some of the planets, so that the religion took on an astral character. This was characteristic of all the Semitic religions, except that of the Old Testament. A different development was the feature of local gods. This resulted especially from the growth of civilization and the rise of cities. Each city had its own god, developed it may be from a spirit of that region, or one of the greater gods associated in some way with that locality. Local gods were thus in a sense a development of the more general nature worship, although the connection with nature might become somewhat obscured as a result of the local feature of the worship. Among the western Semites particular prominence was given to the course of the year, the change of sea-

[1] Jastrow, "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 48.

sons, etc., in their supposed teaching concerning the gods. There are doubtless, also, traces of totemism and ancestor worship among the Semites. Totemism should probably be considered a development of animism, the life of animals being regarded as similar to that of gods and men. Ancestor worship was not directly connected with animism, its immediate source being probably the mystery of death. How far the representation of the gods as animals—which is common, especially among the Babylonians—is due to totemism may be questioned. To some extent this feature is doubtless to be regarded as symbolical rather than pictorial, the animal forms being employed in this connection as symbols of power. An anthropomorphic tendency was doubtless present from the first, the very idea of animism coming from attributing features of human life to inanimate objects. In the close connection of the gods with nature, however, this idea might not be prominent. But some anthropomorphic tendency is inevitable in thinking of powers not definitely known. Hence, as a matter of fact, the anthropomorphic side was prominent in the Semitic religions, and the gods were represented in human form, particularly by the Babylonians and Assyr-

ians.[1] This anthropomorphism may have been aided by ancestor worship, but is doubtless not wholly due to that influence.

Personality. Personality is prominent in all the Semitic religions. The thought of personality might not unnaturally be obscured in two ways. Nature gods might easily retain so much connection with nature that personality was obscured; they were little more than forces of nature. In all the religions under consideration, except that of the Old Testament, the gods, as we have seen, were nature gods in their origin, and did not entirely lose their character as such. Yet, in all, there has been so much development of the ideas that the personality of the principal gods is not sensibly obscured. The connection with nature is subordinate. The Babylonian god Shamash, *e. g.*, was the sun-god, and this fact was apparently always kept conspicuously in mind by ordinarily using the determinative for divine beings when the sun itself is designated, by the same word. Yet the distinctive character of Shamash was as the god of justice, in which conception the idea of

[1] Nielsen, "*Die altarabische Mondreligion*," p. 118, claims that in the South Arabic religion no god was worshiped as animal or man. There are representations of gods in these forms, however, which he considers to be only symbolical.

personality was prominent. The minor gods, however, as well as the spirits, have no strongly marked individuality, so that in these the idea of personality is not conspicuous. The other way in which personality might be obscured is by a pantheistic tendency. There are traces of this among the Semites, but only as a result of philosophical speculation concerning divine unity, as will be noted. The popular religion does not tend in this direction. Personality, then, is nearly as prominent in the other Semitic religions as in the Old Testament. The Egyptian religion tended somewhat more strongly, in a speculative way, toward pantheism, but here also personality was ordinarily a strongly marked feature.

In some respects, in fact, personality was overemphasized in the Semitic religions. This is, of course, natural in polytheism. As the connection with nature diminished, the gods were thought of as unusual men in their characteristics. Divine transcendence is not marked in polytheism, although there were clearer traces of it in the Semitic religions than in most others. Not only an anthropomorphic method of representation, but anthropomorphic conceptions were a prominent characteristic of all the other Semitic re-

ligions, except that of the Old Testament. This appears prominently in the Babylonian mythology, where human traits and emotions are a conspicuous feature of the relations of the gods with each other. In the Old Testament there is much anthropomorphic representation, but the later teaching, at any rate, cannot be considered to result from anthropomorphic conceptions. Some Old Testament phrases which seem to present marked anthropomorphic conceptions are evidently survivals in language from an earlier time, *e. g.*, the not uncommon description of sacrifices as the "bread of God."

Unity. The noticeable feature here is the contrast between the monotheism of the Old Testament teaching and the polytheism of all the other Semitic nations and Egypt. The oft-discussed question whether the earlier Old Testament teaching should be called monotheism or monolatry is unimportant here, for no one doubts that most of the Old Testament doctrine, including all the later part, can be called by no other name than monotheism. Neither is the question of the origin either of the name or worship of Yahweh of any particular importance in this connection; for that does not affect the prevailing teaching of the

Old Testament. In all the other religions considered polytheism is conspicuous. The origin of the Semitic religions has already been indicated. In harmony with that is the fact that all these religions, except that of the Old Testament, are polytheistic, and in some the gods are very numerous. The early Babylonian pantheon, before Hammurabi, contained sixty-five gods and goddesses known by name, according to the list given by Jastrow,[1] aside from many spirits. The Arabs had also many gods,[2] and also subordinate spirits known as jinns. The gods of the southern Arabs so far found are comparatively few in number. The Phœnician deities were about fifty in all.[3] Several different gods are mentioned in the early Aramaic inscriptions, as well as in the Old Testament accounts of the Arameans. The scantiness of information concerning the other Semitic nations—Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Canaan—does not allow very definite statements, but it is clear that they were polytheists.

It may be asked, however, whether there are not approximations to monotheism in these other religions. In several ways, somewhat related, they

[1] "*Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*," I, p. 51f.
[2] See Wellhausen, "*Reste arabischen Heidentums*," 2d ed., *passim*.
[3] Thatcher, in "Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible," III, p. 861.

did approach monotheism: these can be traced chiefly in the Babylonian and Assyrian religions. One way is through gradations among the gods. In all systems of polytheism some gods are more powerful or more prominent than others. This comes about chiefly through the local relations of the gods. In early times one god was especially the god of a city or district. As nations were formed by the union of cities and districts through conquest or otherwise, all the gods were included in the pantheon of the whole region. But each god still retained his special seat; and in general the power of the god corresponded to the political power of the city where his worship was localized. The god of the capital city was head of the pantheon. Thus Marduk, the god of Babylon, was the head of the later Babylonian pantheon; Ashur, the god of the city Ashur, was the chief god of Assyria. The supreme god was often spoken of with an emphasis on his power that separates him from the remaining gods. There are many hymns in which this is done with Marduk. Thus it is even said of him, "Thou bearest the might of Anu, the might of Bel, the might of Ea, dominion and majesty." [1] This does

[1] Jastrow, "*Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*," I, p. 513.

not mean, however, that Marduk is identified with these gods, but that in his position as head of the pantheon he has taken their attributes. There is to be noticed here a monarchical tendency, corresponding to the concentration of power in the hands of the human monarch. Ashur was distinctively an Assyrian god, and the only one of the Assyrian pantheon who was such. If his worship originated in Babylonia it was of slight importance there. It thus came about that his power in Assyria was very great. In the worship of Ashur, however, there is no difference in kind from the other gods, but only in degree. The Assyrian kings mention prominently many other gods along with Ashur, and are named for them.

The quotation given in reference to Marduk suggests a more general matter, viz., a tendency to syncretism, or identification of different gods with each other. This is seen in the Babylonian religion, *e. g.*, in the identification of Marduk with Bel, the god being known as Bel-Marduk, and probably in the identification of Sin and Nannar, Shamash and Babbar, etc. Partial transference of the same kind is seen in the passing of attributes from one deity to another. Especially, as in the case above, it is Marduk the supreme god

who absorbs the characteristics of others. In one text he seems to absorb their personalities, so that it is said, "Ninib is Marduk of strength, Nergal is Marduk of battle, Zamama is Marduk of slaughter, Bel is Marduk of rule and order, Nabu is Marduk of business, Sin is Marduk as illuminator of night, Shamash is Marduk as lord of all which is just, Adad is Marduk of rain, Sukh is Marduk of the army, ——— Marduk ———, Shukamuna is Marduk of clay vessel." [1] Similar texts give to Ea, Bel, Ninib, Nergal, and Adad the same rôle as Marduk has in this text. This, however, is not monotheism: it rather means that these great gods are representatives of Marduk the supreme deity, or of other gods.

Another way in which an approach to monotheism arose was the following: A worshiper whose attention was concentrated upon one god used extravagant language in reference to him, language which suggests a monotheistic idea. Thus of Sin, the Babylonian moon-god, it is said, "In heaven who is exalted? Thou alone art exalted. On earth who is exalted? Thou alone art exalted." [2] But there are no indications that

[1] Published by Pinches, "Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute," XXXIII (1896), p. 8f.
[2] Jastrow, "The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 304.

such worshipers devoted themselves simply to one god; these expressions are merely rhetorical and devotional. In fact, in this very hymn other gods are recognized, in the statement, "O Lord, chief of the gods, who on earth and in heaven alone is exalted." Of Nabu, again, it is said, in an inscription on a statue of his by an officer of Adadnirari III, "O posterity, trust in Nabu, trust not in another god." [1] This is thought to show a political tendency, rather than a religious. It is noticeable also that in this inscription there is recognition of Ea and Bel.

The Egyptian religion has somewhat different tendencies toward monotheism. Reference has already been made to a tendency toward pantheism, which is such more truly than toward monotheism. Maspero [2] quite certainly overstates the case when he says, "The scribes, the priests, the officials, all the educated world, in fact, of Egyptian society, never professed that gross paganism which caused Egypt to be called with justice 'the mother of superstitions.' The various names and innumerable forms attributed by the multitude

[1] K B, I, p. 192; Baentsch, "*Altorientalischer und israelitischer Monotheismus*," p. 10.
[2] Quoted by Sayce, "The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia," p. 246.

to as many distinct and independent divinities were for them merely names and forms of one and the same being." This philosophical speculation was probably of much less importance than has often been supposed. A form of monotheism was doubtless introduced into Egypt by the " heretic king " Amenhotep IV, in the worship of Aten, the solar disk. There is much that is uncertain about this movement. It does not seem to be connected with the pantheistic tendency already noted. It is questionable to what an extent the movement was due to foreign influence, and whether it should not be considered a political movement rather than a religious one. In any case, it lasted but a brief time. Some other manifestations of the sun-god seem to have been worshiped along with Aten, so that perhaps it should not be called in the full sense monotheism. This can hardly be regarded as definitely establishing any pronounced tendency in the real Egyptian religion toward monotheism.

It seems evident from what has been said that the utmost tendency toward monotheism in the Semitic religions meant only that one god was often regarded more highly than another, sometimes to an extreme extent. But it was rarely, if

ever, that any worshiped one god exclusively, and there was seldom an idea that the worship of one god was hostile to that of another, except in the case of a god of a hostile land. The Egyptian tendency was no stronger than the Semitic, except as there was a greater inclination toward pantheism.

A noticeable tendency has recently appeared to speak of an ancient Oriental monotheism as existing generally among the Semitic nations and in Egypt, being most conspicuously exemplified among the Babylonians and Assyrians, Arabs and Egyptians.[1] This is generally regarded as being in its nature pantheistic—a teaching that all the gods were but manifestations of one being. The evidence for this view has for the most part been indicated in what has already been said. A prominent consideration, however, is the idea that this doctrine was of an esoteric nature, being confined to the priests. The general existence of such esoteric doctrine, however, may well be questioned. The view depends largely upon the interpretation of some passages, chiefly in the Bab-

[1] On this see especially Jeremias, "*Monotheistische Strömungen innerhalb der babylonischen Religion*"; Baentsch, "*Altorientalischer und israelitischer Monotheismus*"; Nielsen, "*Die altarabische Mondreligion und die mosaische Ueberlieferung*"; and Jeremias, "*Das alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*," 2d ed.

ylonian inscriptions, such as have already been cited. These seem to the writer to suggest a monarchical or syncretistic rather than a pantheistic view of the deities.

Nielsen [1] presents, however, a view that monotheism was the early common-Semitic belief, and polytheism a later development. The idea of Lagrange [2] seems to be quite similar. Nielsen maintains that a conception of god as one and an ethical personality is found in the early religion of South Arabia, and was a primitive common-Semitic idea. *"Der Gottesbegriff ist hier höchst einfach, ist in keiner Weise versinnlicht und mit irgend etwas Aeusseren in Verbindung gebracht; nichts deutet darauf hin, dass der Wirkungskreis dieses Gottes auf ein bestimmtes Gestirn, Ort oder Volk beschränkt ist, dass wir hier einen Astral- Lokal- oder Nationalgott vor uns haben; es ist die Rede von 'Gott,' niemals von 'Göttern.' Anstatt äusserer Bestimmungen des göttlichen Wesens finden sich eine Fülle von Prädikaten, die dem Gottesbegriffe ethische, persönliche Eigenschaften beilegen. Gott ist die gerechte Liebe, gut, gnädig, segnend u. s. w., ein persönlicher Gott, denn er*

[1] *"Die altarabische Mondreligion und die mosaische Ueberlieferung,"* especially p. 10f.
[2] *"Études sur les Religions Sémitiques,"* pp. 70-83.

weiss, erinnert, erhört u. s. w., ein gerechter Gott, der seine Gebote den Menschen erteilt, aber vor allen Dingen ein liebender Gott, der mit den Menschen in Bund tritt und ihnen den Frieden verlieht." [1]

This view, however, does not seem to be justified by the evidence. There are ethical traits here, to be sure, but the facts presented do not warrant the conclusion that here is a god who approaches ethical completeness. The evidence of the author comes primarily from South Arabian proper names, which have such forms as *waddada-ilu,* god loves; *tsadaq-ilu,* god is righteous; *ilu-magir,* god is kind, etc. These proper names are found in inscriptions, but are believed by Nielsen to show an earlier stage of the religion than the inscriptions themselves. These names are supplemented by similar names from Babylonian inscriptions, from the period of Hammurabi and earlier. God here, it is said by Nielsen, is one, as indicated by the use simply of the word *ilu,* and fully ethical, as indicated by these characteristics of his which are stated. But the unconfirmed evidence of the proper names is an un-

[1] "*Die altarabische Mondreligion und die mosaische Ueberlieferung,*" p. 10f.

certain reliance for so general a conclusion. In fact, the inscriptions of South Arabia testify to at least three or four astral deities, of a nature similar to the corresponding gods in the Babylonian pantheon. It seems highly probable, therefore, that there was always a plurality of gods in the conception of the Southern Arabs, and that they were nature gods, and only imperfectly ethical.

The argument for monotheism from the use of *ilu* is very precarious. Such a usage might readily be found under polytheism, for various reasons. One reason might be that the god in mind was the special god of the locality, not called by name because well known; another, that the names were familiar ones, and used in an abbreviated or generalized form, as was often the case.

Monotheism is by no means so exclusively the feature which gives superiority to a religion as is sometimes assumed. Monotheism alone does not assure a high standard, as is evidenced by Muhammadanism. Yet it is a necessary condition of high development. The ethical character of religion is inevitably imperfect under polytheism: the gods in a polytheistic system are for the most part non-ethical or unethical in their character, as will be seen more fully later.

Spirituality. Spirituality is a marked characteristic of the Old Testament teaching: it is largely absent from the religions of the other Semitic nations and Egypt. Some have questioned, however, how fully the spirituality of Yahweh is taught in the Old Testament. It is undoubtedly true that this conception was one which the Hebrews had great difficulty in grasping. The popular religion of every period before the exile had only an imperfect idea of it. Yet the teaching of the Old Testament made it prominent from the first. The second commandment, which must in any case be relatively early, if it does not directly teach the spirituality of God, strongly implies it. This feature is always emphasized as well in the teachings of the prophets.

Several things may seem to teach limitations of the spirituality of God in the Old Testament. One is the emphasis upon personality, with the resulting anthropomorphisms. It has perhaps already been sufficiently indicated under personality that this does not denote a real limitation. Another thing is the connection of Yahweh with nature. It is held by many that the conception of Yahweh in the early part of the Old Testament includes many traits of a nature god.

But, in any case, it is not claimed that this appears in the teaching of the later part of the Old Testament. Further, these descriptions of natural phenomena in connection with the theophanies of Yahweh are of such variety that they clearly do not indicate that he is thought of as a nature god. Another feature is the externality of the worship. This has two phases which need consideration. One is that the worship is localized, at first to some extent in connection with the ark, and afterward at the temple. This no doubt made it easy to think of the center of worship as the abode of Yahweh. But such was not the real meaning of this feature. Rather, the centralization of worship indicates, prominently at least, an emphasis upon the religious *unity* of the nation. It is clearly taught that the temple is not the real abode of Yahweh. That abode is often spoken of as heaven, but even that is considered as unable to contain him, as it is expressed in the prayer of Solomon (1 Kings 8 : 27), "But will God in very deed dwell on the earth? behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded!" The other phase is the prominence of ritual, external rites, in the worship. These rites may be of such

a nature as to imply a belief in God as material, or they may not. Certain features in connection with sacrifices might seem to look rather definitely in this direction. The origin of Semitic sacrifices, as will be seen later, is doubtless to be sought in a physical conception of God. Some phrases used also imply that thought, as the description of the sacrifices as לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים, *bread of God*. But this early thought has doubtless disappeared, at least largely, in the Old Testament teaching concerning sacrifices, although not in the popular conception. The culmination of the teaching concerning God, further, as will be indicated later, is not found in the sacrifices, but in the prophetical writings.

There is no real conception of spirituality in the other Semitic religions. In origin the gods are material, being connected with the objects of nature. And this connection is never entirely lost from view. In their later development, however, as has already been said, emphasis was placed upon the idea of personality. Then the gods were regarded as men of superior power; and they were no more regarded as pure spirit than man is. Again, the representations of the gods show the same state of things. In all these other Semitic religions the gods were regularly represented by

images. Of course it is always a possibility that in some minds an image may have been regarded in a purely symbolical way, and the god not identified with the image. The common use of images, however, would show that this was not the prevailing view. The treatment of the images shows, moreover, that in general the god was thoroughly identified with the image. By the Assyrians and Babylonians, *e. g.*, the images of conquered cities or countries, whether related peoples or not, were carried off to the capital of the conqueror; and later they were sometimes rescued and returned to their original locations. The forbidding of images in the second commandment in the Old Testament brings the Old Testament into sharp contrast at this point with the Semitic customs and thought universal elsewhere.

In Egypt practically the same condition is found as in the general Semitic thought. Here also the gods were thought of in general as men, and were represented by images and also by animals.

The later conceptions in all these nations, so far as known, tended somewhat toward the idea of spirituality, but failed to attain to it. The grossness of the early materialistic conceptions was

somewhat refined, but not entirely lost. The broadening of political divisions effected a similar condition in the sphere of religion; the god who was early limited to a small territory became identified with a much larger region. The conquering gods, such as Ashur, were considered to conquer the territory of other gods. Yet the power of the gods never went far beyond the country subject to them, the conception of any god as having dominion over the world being ordinarily unattainable under polytheism. And even that conception would not necessarily be a conception of a spiritual being, although it would approach to it.

The pantheistic speculation of the Egyptians looks in the direction of spirituality. But this, as has already been remarked, probably had but little real effect upon the religion as a whole; neither was it clearly a spiritual conception.

The *monarchical* form of polytheism, already referred to, marks a culmination in the exaltation of the power of a single god, and a consequent diminution of the local limitations. Yet some idea of these limitations remained.

A certain transcendental element in the Babylonian religion comes from the fact that, in the later thought, the proper home of the gods was

in heaven, their earthly abodes being simply the counterpart of their heavenly residences. This marks a contrast with humanity, and affords a starting-point for the idea of spirituality, which, however, remains no more than a slight tendency.

II

METAPHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES

AS usually stated in modern phraseology the natural or metaphysical attributes of God are eternity, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience. A statement as definitely theological as this goes beyond the treatment of the Old Testament. Yet substantially the modern idea is found there. The teaching is that Yahweh is indefinitely superior to ordinary human limitation in regard to time, power, space, and knowledge. In particular this is strongly affirmed in the prophets. Modern language speaks of God as infinite. The Old Testament writers meant very nearly the same when they spoke, *e. g.*, of the majesty of God. The difference is that while the term infinite is theoretical, without limitations, the Old Testament thought is usually practical, indefinitely transcending human limitations. Yet the difference is slight, and at times the Old Testament statements contain strong theoretical affirmations. The religions of the other Semitic nations show

contrast with the Old Testament far more than resemblance at this point; the gods only imperfectly transcend human limitations, as will be seen from a more detailed consideration.

Eternity. Some of the strongest affirmations on this point in the Old Testament are found in the following passages, Exod. 15 : 18; Ps. 10 : 16; 103 : 17; Isa. 51 : 6; 41 : 4; 43 : 10; 44 : 6; 48 : 12. In accordance with the practical nature of the Old Testament these passages speak more especially of limitless duration in the future, yet they speak of the past as well. In some cases the words used express only indefinite duration, in others it is clearly limitless. The many passages in which God is spoken of as creator of all things look in the same direction, *i. e.,* they indicate indefinite past duration, although not necessarily eternal.

Polytheism brings time limitation in two ways: it limits the gods in their past history by reason of the fact that one is descended from another; and it limits them to a certain extent in the same way by their connection with created material objects, especially the sun, moon, and stars. The first tendency would of course leave it possible that the earliest god should be thought of as ex-

isting from limitless time in the past. As a matter of fact, however, there is no real evidence of such a conception. Several Babylonian gods are spoken of in different accounts as creators of everything; but this is a general, poetic phrase, conveying no very specific meaning. In the real Babylonian system the earliest triad as ordinarily reckoned, all standing on an equality in point of origin, was Anu, Bel, and Ea. Anu was god of heaven, Bel of earth, and Ea of water. But back of these were two—a male and female—An-shar and Ki-shar, shadowy beings, seldom referred to, mere general personifications of heaven and earth. Hence, it is evident that among the Babylonians there is no definite idea of past eternal existence of any god. Among the other Semitic nations there is hardly material enough to form the basis of a definite statement, but apparently the facts are somewhat similar. It is evident that in all the connection of the deities with natural objects is prominent. The Egyptian representation of the age of the gods is very confused and inconsistent. But as the prominent worship is solar, that constitutes a limitation.

In general it is evident that so far as concerns the future the gods were thought of as living in-

definitely. It is not a point which is directly touched upon, however, so much as it is assumed. But the material connection here also interposes a limit to theoretical eternity, although not to indefinite duration, practically considered. The gods were like men in many ways, and they fought with each other, but ordinarily did not destroy each other: they were only occasionally represented as subject to death. The connection with material objects doubtless helped to convey the idea of unlikeness to men at this point.

Omnipotence. The Old Testament expresses very strongly the omnipotence of God. Usually, of course, it is considered in certain practical relations. Yet there are many assertions that the power of God is indefinitely above any human power, and in marked contrast with the powerlessness of the gods of the nations. The power of God is contemplated usually from two associated points of view: as exhibited in creation, and as shown in his continual control over nature, individuals, and nations. There is a wide sweep of his power, no nation of the earth, no part of the universe even, being outside of its scope. These teachings are found especially in such passages as Isa. 40; 43 : 13; 45 : 9; Amos

9 : 7; Jer. 18. How much limitation of this conception may be found in the early part of the Old Testament is unimportant, inasmuch as the teaching of these passages represents at any rate the height which is reached and maintained by the Old Testament.

In all the other Semitic religions it is evident that much emphasis was placed upon the power of the gods: they were regarded as far superior to men. It can hardly be doubted that the early common-Semitic word for god was the one found in the Hebrew, אל, the same word being in use in nearly or quite all the other Semitic languages.[1] The derivation, and hence the original significance, of this word are much disputed. It seems probable to the writer, however, that this original significance was *to be strong*. If so, the prominent early idea concerning the gods was that of strength.

It is also evident, however, that the power of the gods falls far short of omnipotence. There are limitations to divine power, limitations which vary greatly in their force at different points, yet which are never passed. Polytheism itself consti-

[1] See especially Lagrange, "*Études sur les Religions Sémitiques*," pp. 70-83.

tutes an important limitation. The power of one god is greatly limited by that of others, in a polytheistic system. This appears, *e. g.*, in the Babylonian mythology, where the gods quarrel among themselves and one thwarts the plans of others. Of course the supreme god is superior chiefly in power. But that power does not reach omnipotence.

Closely connected with this is another idea, which constitutes a more definite limitation. This was the idea of local gods. Originally the power of a god was conceived as confined to the city where he dwelt and the region immediately about. This continued to be the conception to a certain extent in all these religions. Yet in process of time, especially as a result of the unification of national life, this conception lost somewhat its definite character, although it did not entirely disappear. There remained in full force, at any rate, the national limitation. The power of a god was ordinarily limited to the territory of his own nation. Babylonia and Assyria religiously were in most respects one nation. Hence, the power of a Babylonian god might extend over Babylonia and Assyria, but would not necessarily do so; and would ordinarily be limited to that region.

It is doubtless a result of the same general idea that the gods in general in the Babylonian religion have no relation with the underworld, Aralu. This is conceived of as a place, but one with which the ordinary gods have nothing to do. It has a god and goddess of its own, commonly known as Nergal and Allatu. The teachings on this matter will be further discussed at a later point.

Another limitation in power is also conspicuous —limitation in the sphere of activity of a particular god. As the idea of local gods became less distinct, this other limitation increased in force. In the early conception a god had control of only a small region, yet within that region the sphere of his activity was not expressly limited. Later, inasmuch as many gods had power over the same region, or even over a whole nation, it was inevitable that conflict of authority should be avoided to a certain extent by limiting the sphere of the activity of each one, although of course this was done but imperfectly. Shamash, *e. g.*, in the Babylonian system, was the god of justice, with which none of the other gods had much to do; Nabu was the god of literature, etc. So fully was this felt that when literary activity became promi-

nent in Assyria, in the reign of Shalmaneser II and his successors, the worship of Nabu received a new impetus, so that Adadnirari III built him a temple in Kalkhi; and this in spite of the fact that in general the power of Ashur, the great god of Assyria, had less limitation, perhaps, than that of any other Semitic god.

The Babylonian incantation literature shows limitations in the power of the gods. An especially powerful god is appealed to, with the belief that his power will prevail over that of another god, who is indifferent or hostile. This literature also indicates that the god always obeyed, necessarily, the incantation if it was exactly right, *i. e.*, there were formulæ which surely had power over the god. This literature is not the highest expression of the Babylonian religion; still it constitutes an important part of it.

In some ways individual limitations, before mentioned, were diminished in particular cases, especially by war. Church and State were inseparably connected in these religions: the divine power varied with the power of the king. Conquest added to the power of the special god of the victorious king; the conquered land became a part of his territory; the gods as well were conquered

and became subject to him. But this increase of power itself emphasizes its limitation. It is not world-wide, it is a power which actually embraces only the lands included in the empire. Statements that go beyond this are general and rhetorical, parallel to the rhetorical phrases in which the king emphasizes his own power.

Probably Ashur had less local limitation than any other Semitic deity. He was the head of the Assyrian pantheon, as Marduk of the Babylonian. But the worship of Marduk was closely connected with his city, Babylon; and he is usually mentioned in connection with several other Babylonian gods who approach him quite closely in prominence, especially Nabu. Ashur, as well, was originally the god of the city Ashur; but his worship is never connected in any distinctly local sense with that city. Rather, as the country receives his name along with the city, he becomes at an early date distinctly the national god rather than a city god. The uncertainty concerning the meaning and origin of the name Ashur does not materially affect the facts as stated. As a national god a new temple was built for him whenever the capital was moved, from Ashur to Kalkhi, and from Kalkhi to Nineveh; but the worship was

still continued in the others. He was distinctly the national god of Assyria, not of Babylonian origin, unless remotely. He was especially a warlike god, and as such his most distinctive representation was by a warlike standard carried from place to place. As the national warlike god he was regarded in a more exclusive way than any Babylonian god: no other god whom the Assyrians worshiped could approach him in power. Yet the Assyrian kings ordinarily mentioned other gods at the same time with him in their inscriptions. Adadnirari III placed special emphasis upon the worship of Nabu, and Shamash is mentioned prominently along with Ashur, *e. g.*, by Shalmaneser and Tiglathpileser III. Ashur has no consort in any real sense, which gives a suggestion of exclusiveness. Yet this idea can easily be carried too far, especially in view of the facts previously mentioned. The facts do not warrant such extreme statements as are made by Sayce,[1] "Assur consequently differs from the Babylonian gods, not only in the less narrowly local character that belongs to him, but also in his solitary nature. . . He is like the king of Assyria himself, brooking no rival, allowing neither wife nor son to

[1] "The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia," p. 371f.

share in the honors which he claims for himself alone. He is essentially a jealous god, and as such sends forth his Assyrian adorers to destroy his unbelieving foes. . . We can, in fact, trace in him all the lineaments upon which, under other conditions, there might have been built up as pure a faith as that of the God of Israel."

Omnipresence. In the Old Testament this is emphatically taught in relation to Yahweh. Even in the earlier portions there can have been but little limitation on this point. It is the same God who is with Abraham in Ur, and Palestine, and with his descendants in Egypt, and later in Palestine. The freedom of Yahweh from the limitations of space is found with emphasis in such passages as Gen. 28 : 15; Amos 9 : 2-4; Jer. 23 : 23f; Isa. 43 : 2; Ps. 139 : 5-10. The last passage, and others show Yahweh in complete control of Sheol, a control which in some of the earliar passages appears less definitely.

The general conception in the other religions need be touched only briefly. Substantially it has been covered in what has been said already in reference to omnipotence. One of the limitations in power constitutes, of course, the chief limitation in reference to space, the conception of local gods.

The conception was at most a national one: the presence of the god on earth does not extend beyond the land in which he dwells, except as conquest increases the dominion. The god goes no farther than the king does.

Omniscience. This also is strongly asserted in reference to Yahweh in the Old Testament. It is associated closely with the other natural attributes, especially with omnipresence, in the Old Testament treatment. Many of the passages given in reference to omnipresence teach this as well. It is emphasized in the Old Testament that the knowledge of Yahweh embraces the universe. It also includes that which is hidden from men, especially the inner thoughts and purposes of individuals. Particularly in the prophets Yahweh's knowledge of the future is emphasized; this is known to him as well as the present. He is therefore able to make his plans with reference to the future, and has the power to carry out these plans.

In the other religions the limitations already stated apply here as well. All the limitations previously mentioned imply or demand limitation of knowledge also. The Old Testament conception, just mentioned, of Yahweh's knowledge of the future course of events in the world is with-

out parallel in the other religions. The Old Testament prophecy which is based upon this conception thus stands by itself without a parallel in the other Semitic religions.

The Babylonian penitential psalms indicate that the gods were considered to have an extensive knowledge of their worshipers. They knew especially their failures and sins, some of which were unknown to the individuals themselves. This appears in the frequent appeal to the gods in reference to some offense unwittingly committed. But this is not a knowledge as thorough as the Old Testament speaks of as belonging to Yahweh.

III

MORAL ATTRIBUTES

IT is often thought that there is a fundamental conception of the Old Testament, that of the holiness of Yahweh, expressed by the root קדש and derived words, which should be included at this point, on the ground that by holiness is meant ethical completeness. It therefore seems necessary to discuss a little this conception of holiness.[1] The meaning *ethical completeness* must be rejected. There is very little to favor the meaning. There are only a few passages which seem to suggest it, in which holiness appears to be a strong general designation of the character and activity of Yahweh. In general, however, the use of the word does not suggest an ethical meaning, but a ritual. According to the usual treatment of the matter, it seems difficult to assign any very definite meaning to *holiness,* particularly as used of God. In reference to men, animals, and material

[1] See especially the treatment of Baudissin, "*Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte,*" II, pp. 1-142.

objects it is supposed to mean, and doubtless often does mean, *consecrated to God;* but this suggests no definite meaning for the word as applied to God himself.

Probably the most common view at the present time is that the root קדש meant originally *to be separate, separated.* Then this came to mean, when applied elsewhere than to God, separated *from* sin and uncleanness, and separated *unto* God. As used of God, it meant separation from created things, especially from their imperfection, sin, and uncleanness. It is conceded, however, that the meaning *to be separate* for the root is only conjectural, and is assigned on the supposition that the original form of the root was קד, which is found in other words having a general meaning *to cut.* This etymological basis, however, is very uncertain; hence it seems to the present writer that there is no real evidence concerning the original meaning of the root.

In Babylonian the verb is found, *quddushu,* with the usual meaning *to make clean,* ceremonially; although the common meaning of the Hebrew *to dedicate to God* seems to be the basis of the meaning of the Babylonian *qadishtu, a temple prostitute.* In Hebrew, also, as well as in Babylo-

nian, there are passages in which the words under discussion are apparently used simply of ceremonial cleanness, as in 1 Sam. 21 : 5. It is probable, therefore, that the earliest meaning which can now be traced is this, *to be ceremonially clean.* The first application of this meaning was doubtless to men, animals, and material objects, not to God. But later it was applied to God, as denoting the one who is pure, free from all ceremonial uncleanness. Since, however, it is an essential condition that whatever is consecrated to God should be ceremonially clean, the word takes on this added meaning, *consecrated to God, sacred.* As used of God, the word also assumes various connotations, to some extent adding an ethical idea to the ceremonial, although the latter remains always the prominent conception. As the thought of the word suggests a contrast with many human and material objects, it gains an added significance along this line, suggesting somewhat the power of God. It is interesting, however, in this connection, to note that Ezekiel, the ritual prophet, uses *holy* of Yahweh, but never *righteous;* while his contemporary, Jeremiah, reverses the usage, never applying *holy* to Yahweh, except in chap. 50 and 51, probably later than Jeremiah in their present

form, although in 23 : 9 he applies it to the words of Yahweh.

In Babylonian, as has been said, the common meaning of the word is the early one, *to be clean,* ceremonially, or, as there used in the intensive stem, *to make clean.* In Hebrew this meaning is found in a few cases. This meaning is also found in the application of the word to Yahweh in Hebrew, although with additional connotations, as has been noted. The word is applied to the gods, outside of Hebrew, only in the Phœnician, so far as has been found. In the inscription of Eshmunazar in that language (ll. 9 and 22),[1] the gods are called אלנם הקרשם and האלנם הקרשם, *the holy gods.* The meaning here is evidently similar to that in the Hebrew when applied to Yahweh. The derived meaning, *to consecrate to god,* is found in the Babylonian *qadishtu,* as noted, and is the common meaning in the Hebrew, when applied to objects other than God. The same use is found in Phœnician, Aramaic, Arabic, and Ethiopic.

So far as these words are concerned, then, they do not show any general ethical conception of the character of Yahweh, as is often thought. The conception of holiness, in fact, in the Old Testa-

[1] CIS I, 3.

ment has to do with Yahweh in relation to ritual matters. The prominent thought is that Yahweh is ceremonially pure, and as such demands cleanness and abhors uncleanness. This ritual conception is evidently based upon an original physical idea of the divine; yet it seems clear that this physical thought is not retained in the Old Testament. Nevertheless, this ceremonial side of the conception of God is found, which is based upon the common-Semitic ideas. The ritual legislation, where this idea is largely found, presents then, in general, a more primitive conception of Yahweh than is found elsewhere.

Aside from the ritual legislation, the presentation of the character of Yahweh is distinctly ethical—ethical completeness belongs to him. This is not shown in any one word so much as in the whole treatment of the character of God: he has regard to the ethical as well as the religious life of men, and demands of them moral acts; see also what is said later under *righteousness*. Immoral acts are forbidden, sometimes specifically, *e. g.*, in the case of prostitution, in connection with the worship of Yahweh. The prophets, psalmists, and wisdom writers present the character of Yahweh as thoroughly ethical. This is the distinctive

feature of the Old Testament teaching concerning the moral character of Yahweh.

There is no conception like this in the other religions. Such an idea as ethical completeness is not found in connection with any of their gods. For the most part the gods of the other Semitic religions are non-moral, as is natural with gods derived from the forces of nature. This means that there is no moral side to their character. Some gods are immoral; they sanction or command acts which are immoral. Among the Assyrians and Babylonians this was true especially of Ishtar of Babylonia, who was worshiped with prostitution. The Ishtar cult was certainly widely extended among the Semites, and this was doubtless a usual feature of the worship.[1] Where ethical traits are found in the teachings concerning the gods, they are incomplete, it is only isolated features that appear. For the consideration of Nielsen's view of early common-Semitic ethical monotheism, see the treatment under monotheism.

There are several specific moral attributes of Yahweh emphasized in the Old Testament which should be noticed briefly.

Faithfulness. Faithfulness or trustworthiness

[1] See especially Barton, "A Sketch of Semitic Origins," pp. 42f, 84.

is one of the most prominent of these attributes. In the Old Testament treatment this is regarded as one of the notable results of Yahweh's eternity: because he continues from age to age, his plans and purposes, his character, are the same. This is a trait which gives encouragement to his worshipers: their treatment will be in accord with his well-known character, not arbitrary or erratic. The uniformity of his attitude can be depended on: he acts in accordance with fixed principles. The presence of ritual offenses only slightly modifies this, because, as will be seen later, the ritual element is not to be regarded as the culmination of the Old Testament, and is held, in fact, within narrowly circumscribed limits.

It is only to a slight extent that this trait can be discerned in any of the other Semitic religions. The way in which the favor of any of the gods could be secured and held was a matter on which no definite information could be obtained. Misfortune was really the only indication that anything was wrong in the relations with the gods. The nation, and the king as its principal representative, could depend on the favor of the gods as no individual was able to do. Yet national disaster was not unknown, indicating the anger of

some god, an anger that might be due merely to divine caprice. In individual life, especially, there were no fixed principles of divine favor. This might be won by moral character, but chiefly by ritual, especially sacrifices, or by magical incantations. In Babylonia the last was the most certain way, while among all the Semitic nations sacrifice was very prominent. In all these religions the ritual and magical element is the prominent feature: it is not to an appreciable extent replaced by anything higher. No stress was laid, further, upon a continuance of the same divine character from age to age. As a matter of fact, the general character of each god did remain the same, for the most part, but in the aggregate there was considerable change. This is specially noticeable among the Babylonians and the Egyptians, where there was a large amount of assimilation of the deities to each other, obscuring the individuality of each, so that phrases originally specially appropriate to one were applied almost indiscriminately. Further, among the Babylonians, at least, there were two or more well-marked phases in the character of several of the prominent gods, which must have discouraged still more any belief in faithfulness as an element

of divine character: *e. g.*, Shamash was the god of war and of justice.

Righteousness. This attribute is expressed in Hebrew by the word צֶדֶק and its derivatives. The fundamental idea of the word is not certain, but it seems to be that that is righteous which is right in the highest sense. The righteousness of Yahweh is used in two ways especially. In the broader sense it is a comprehensive term, suggesting an idea somewhat like the ethical completeness of God, if not directly expressing it. In such a meaning as this it is without parallel among the other Semitic religions, as already noted. This idea may also be somewhat restricted, indicating the ethical completeness of Yahweh with special reference to some particular attribute. In the other way, the narrower sense, the righteousness of Yahweh is his justice, by virtue of which he gives to each man his due, in reward or punishment. In this sense a comparison may profitably be made. Here and there it may be that there are limitations to the teaching of the justice of Yahweh, especially in the earlier parts of the Old Testament. But the general teaching of the Old Testament is that Yahweh deals with men in accordance with their real deserts. The justice of

Yahweh is seen more especially in relation to national affairs. The chosen nation, Israel, was destined for blessings. But this, it was always understood, was only on condition that they obey Yahweh. Yet this condition was often forgotten by the people generally, so that undoubtedly the popular idea, especially shortly before the exile, was that Yahweh must inevitably favor his own people; it was impossible that he should destroy them on account of sin. But the prophets gave no encouragement to this idea, and a large part of their teaching was the insistence upon Yahweh's justice. If the nation sins it will be punished, even destroyed. The special privileges of the chosen nation but increase its guilt, and therefore the certainty of punishment (Amos 3 : 2). Foreign nations are agents in the hands of Yahweh for the punishment of Israel, and consequently they are given the victory. Yet these foreign nations also are in his power, and he will deal justly with them; ultimately they shall be punished as well. The justice of Yahweh in his dealings with all nations is emphasized in such passages as Isa. 3 : 13; 2 : 19, 21; 10 : 23; 14 : 26; 28 : 22. The relation of the individual to Yahweh is not neglected, however, in thinking of

the nation. The justice of God is shown clearly in relation to the individual. This is emphasized especially in some of the later prophets, as in Jer. 31 : 29, 30; Ezek. 18, and often in the wisdom literature.

Such a conception of impartial justice between individuals and nations is not met with outside of the Old Testament. The localization of gods meant the localization of justice as well. The conception of national gods meant that such a god had no relation to other peoples except that of hostility. Justice was inconceivable in reference to dealings with other nations. National disaster was attributed to divine anger, but the grounds of the anger could only imperfectly be grasped; it was not based chiefly upon divine justice. On a smaller scale, the conception that any god was concerned with exact justice to individuals was held only to a limited extent. The prevalence of magic showed lack of confidence in the justice of the deities as well as in their faithfulness. In the character of most of the gods justice does not appear at all. Hardly a trace of the conception of divine justice can be found except in Babylonia, South Arabia, and Egypt. In Babylonia justice cannot be called a trait in the character of any

god except Shamash, although the connection of the gods with each other leads to occasional allusions to it in the case of other gods. Shamash is the "great judge of heaven and earth," [1] and as such is the god of justice. It is from Shamash that Hammurabi says he received his code of laws. Shalmaneser II calls Shamash "the judge of the four quarters of the world, who leads aright mankind." [2] And it was a fairly exalted idea of justice that was found in connection with him. Hammurabi uses such expressions as these, "By the command of Shamash, the great judge of heaven and earth, may I make righteousness to shine forth on the land." "Let any oppressed man, who has a cause, come before my image as king of righteousness!" "In the days that are yet to come, for all future time, may the king who is in the land observe the words of righteousness which I have written upon my monument." "That the strong might not oppress the weak, and that they should give justice to the orphan and the widow." [3]

Yet this is only one phase of the character of Shamash. As a sun-god he has the limitation of

[1] Hammurabi, Code, col. XL, l. 85f. [2] Monolith, col. I, l. 3.
[3] Code, col. XL : ll. 84-88; col. XLI : ll. 1-5, 59-65; col. XL : ll. 59-62.

that material connection. He is also a god of war, in which phase of his character justice was obviously subordinate. His justice had to do with externals. He favored kings not because they were righteous, but because they claimed to be righteous. He is prominent in the incantation texts, where no clear idea of justice can be perceived. These things limit the conception of justice, even in the case of Shamash.

In the Egyptian religion Osiris is the only prominent god whose character shows a conception of justice. He was originally a man, it is said, conspicuous for righteousness and mercy. In his character as judge of men after death he takes into account prominently their moral character as determining their destiny. Yet in other representations of the future life, ritual observances have chiefly to do with the final condition. In general, the prominence of ritual and magic obscures the Egyptian conception of divine justice.

In the South-Arabic religion, the only material so far available showing a conception of divine justice is in the proper names already referred to. Here are found such names as *tsadaq-ilu,* god is righteous. This, of course, without further evi-

dence, can only indicate that there were traces of the conception of divine justice in this religion.

Love, including mercy and grace. Mercy is help to the needy; grace, favor to the undeserving. Both are prominent in all the Old Testament. Love, in some respects a stronger term, is emphasized chiefly in the prophets. It is especially from the grace of God that forgiveness of sins comes and must come, since man is always undeserving by reason of sin. These qualities are ordinarily manifested toward Israel, although it is a part of the prophetic expectation that the nations shall in the future share in the grace and forgiveness of Yahweh. Some instances are found of this participation in the present time; such is the prominent lesson of the book of Jonah. The love of Yahweh clothes itself in the forms of human relationship—father, husband—yet it is not a physical love but an ethical; it is found in the prophets who constantly insist upon the relationship of Yahweh to his people on the ethical side.

This attribute is undoubtedly found to a large extent in all the religions under consideration. In the general Semitic conception the gods are favorable to men. Yet in polytheism, while some

of the gods love, others hate. From early times, however, the unfavorable deities have usually occupied a subordinate place, so that in the Babylonian religion they are largely, but not entirely, spirits rather than gods, and among the Arabs they are the jinns. Mercy and grace, leading to forgiveness, are sought by the suppliants in the Babylonian prayers. But, like other features of the religion, in the general Semitic conception the love and mercy lack an ethical basis; they are rather like ordinary human love. The cause of an unfavorable attitude of the deity is not certainly known; the principles upon which it can be removed are not definitely settled, although in general they are ritual and magical rather than ethical; and the corresponding principles upon which love and mercy depend are obscure. Further, love and mercy have always the local limitations.

PART III

MAN

I

SIN

THERE are, of course, certain questions in relation to man that precede the question of sin. These are especially those that relate to the creation, nature, and constitution of man. But at this point there is very little material for comparison. The accounts in Genesis say that Yahweh created man. The principal creation tablet of the Babylonians already referred to, *enuma elish,* says that Marduk of Babylon created man. The fragment from Eridu attributes this to Marduk of Eridu, originally distinct from Marduk of Babylon. The small fragment in which Ashur appears as the creator does not mention the creation of man. This, however, is doubtless due to its fragmentary condition. It is, therefore, the teaching of the Babylonians as of the Old Testament that man originated by divine creation, although in the separate Babylonian recensions the act is assigned to various gods. There is no clear Semitic teaching, beyond this, concerning the nature

and constitution of man which can be compared with the Old Testament statements.

There can be little question that the other Semitic religions agree with the Old Testament in holding to the universality of sin, in some sense of the term. This is seen from the universality of sacrifice, some forms of which, as will be seen, presuppose sin. It is seen more clearly, in the Babylonian religion, from the so-called penitential psalms, prayers, etc., in which there is confession of sin. The Old Testament account of the fall of man is undoubtedly intended to teach the origin of human sin with the first man. No parallel to this Old Testament account has been found elsewhere, the supposed Babylonian parallel, consisting simply of a picture, is of uncertain meaning, and it is by no means clear that it has any such reference.

From a comparison of the different religions, as will be seen more fully later, it seems reasonably certain that the early conception of sin among the Semites was the doing of that which is displeasing to the gods. But in this early conception, further, the gods cared only for human action so far as it directly concerned them; hence sin consisted in transgression of the regu-

lations in connection with the sacrifices or other features of worship. It thus had to do with ritual acts, and not with one's relation to his fellow-man. Such a conception of sin is not only in harmony with the early ideas concerning the gods, as just noted, but is also indicated as the common-Semitic idea by the fact that it is the prominent element in the ideas of sin among the Semitic nations generally, except among the Hebrews, and their religion has traces of such a conception. The early Semitic conception of sin, then, had no ethical character. It was also without fixed principles, it depended simply upon the will of the gods, and that will, being non-ethical, was capricious; besides, an act might be displeasing to one god that was pleasing to another.

There was but one infallible indication of sin in this early conception, its results. Sin brings punishment without fail. Sickness, disaster, misfortune, death, all are simply the results of sin. These, however, do not show what is wrong, but only that some sin has been committed. It is necessarily uncertain what the sin is in any particular case.

If such is the early Semitic conception, how far has it been retained and how far modified among

the several nations? The most definite information available is concerning the Babylonians, but certain indications among the other nations point also to the conclusion that this early conception has been retained without any great modification among all the nations except the Hebrews.

Among the Babylonians the prevailing conception is simply that which has been indicated; sin is of a ritual nature. There are among this people many tablets dealing with religious subjects in which the matter of sin is treated. These are arranged in several series. In most of the tablets, it is stated by Morgenstern,[1] it is only ritual sin that is recognized; in but one series, called Shurpu, are ethical acts included with ritual, although without distinction between them. This is in harmony with the prevailing non-ethical conception of the divine character among the Babylonians, with some traces of ethical elements.

The question may arise in what way moral offenses came to be included, even to a slight extent, with the ritual. It is obvious that, on the ritual conception, the gods were considered to be selfish: if they themselves were treated with due honor they were not concerned about the treat-

[1] "The Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion," p. 2.

ment of one man by another. The rise of any concern of this kind probably came along the line of the relation of the god to the tribe; he was physically connected with the tribe. Hence, he was interested for the general welfare of the tribe, and at first for particular individuals simply in relation to the whole. But with the growth of individualism, especially arising from change of customs, advance in civilization, and increase of individual possessions, came inevitably some conception of the care of the god for individuals, even when not directly connected with the general tribal welfare. When, under these circumstances, one individual appealed to the god for redress of an injury done by another, it would be necessary for the god, in their conception, to pay some attention to this appeal, and consequently to punish the offender against his fellow-man, *i. e.,* his fellow-tribesman. Thus was developed some conception of sin toward one's fellow-man, but only within the tribe: such a thing as sin toward those outside the tribe or nation was unknown.

Among the Babylonians it was thought that all punishment for sin was inflicted *directly* by demons. At first these were merely the instruments

of the greater gods, the real gods. But after a time the demons were considered to work to a large extent independently, in subordination to the gods, yet usually without direct connection with them. The demons hated men and took delight in inflicting misfortune on them. The gods were sufficiently powerful to prevent the demons from injuring one, yet often they were rather indifferent than otherwise, which attitude gave the demons their opportunity. In sickness the demons were considered to be actually present in the body; hence sickness itself made one unclean, and was therefore not only the result of sin but itself a sin. All dealings with the demons were naturally on a purely ritual basis.

The early teaching that all misfortune is the result of sin was thus retained in the Babylonian conception. The connection was apparently often thought of as indirect rather than direct. The individual had not been sufficiently zealous in keeping the favorable attention of the greater gods so that they would ward off the attacks of the demons. The idea of the activity of the demons was further extended, also, in connection with the witches. These were persons through whom the demons especially worked to the injury of others.

Yet these were often considered really to have control of the activity of the demons. In that case, then, the individual who suffered from the activity of the witches was injured directly by reason of human hostility, that of the witch. Possibly here is to be found some not unnatural inconsistency in the representation, *i. e.,* if suffering comes as a result of human hostility it does not seem that sin has directly to do with it. Yet the prominent idea apparently was that some remissness in relation to the gods, *i. e.,* some sin, had caused them so far to relax their vigilance as to give the witches an opportunity for the exercise of their arts.

Among the other Semitic nations, aside from the Babylonians and the Hebrews, indications that the view of sin is in general the early one here stated come chiefly from the prominence of sacrifice and ritual, and from the absence of positive statements to show any real prevalence of an ethical conception. This is a summary of the state of the case among the Arabs before Muhammad, the Southern Arabs, the Arameans, and the Phœnicians. W. Robertson Smith, evidently basing his view chiefly upon Arabic customs, speaks of "a very primitive type of religion, in which the sense

of sin, in any proper sense of the word, did not exist at all, and the whole object of ritual was to maintain the bond of physical holiness that kept the religious community together." [1] Among the Arabs before Muhammad, according to Wellhausen, the ordinary worship was simply ritual, and the idea of sin was ritual. There was some development of tribal duties, but this was imperfect, while there were no duties to any man outside the tribe. Further, this idea of morality within the tribe, according to Wellhausen, arose from the sense of relationship to the tribe and not from the religion; although this, it seems to the present writer, was indirectly religious, because of the conception of the physical connection of the god with the tribe. There was, however, as a late development, a worship of Allah which had little connection with the cult, in which there was a broader development of the ethical idea.[2] Hence, it would seem that the Arabic conception was very similar to the Babylonian, the early idea of sin was simply ritual, but ultimately acts in the sphere of morals were also included, although not so as to supersede the other conception.

[1] "Religion of the Semites," 2d ed., p. 401.
[2] "*Reste Arabischen Heidentums*," 2d ed., *passim*, especially p. 219 seq.

We come to a consideration of the Old Testament teaching. It is of course generally recognized that the Old Testament regards as sins acts both in the moral and in the ceremonial sphere. The actual relation between the two conceptions, however, is much disputed. In view of what has already been presented, it seems clear that the Old Testament treatment of ceremonial acts as sins is based upon the common-Semitic view already presented, and is in fact substantially the same, although with differences in detail. The underlying principle, so far as these acts are concerned, is the one already enunciated: sin is ritual; any variation from the prescribed ceremonies is sin. This goes so far that in the Old Testament uncleanness is treated as sin, even when it comes from natural causes, as from an accidental occurrence, or disease, or childbirth. Thus uncleanness resulting from unavoidable contact of a Nazirite with a dead body is called sin (Num. 6 : 9-11), "If any man die very suddenly beside him, and he defile the head of his separation; then he shall shave his head in the day of his cleansing, on the seventh day shall he shave it. And on the eighth day he shall bring two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, to the priest, to the door of the

tent of meeting; and the priest shall offer one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering, and make atonement for him, for that he sinned by reason of the dead, and shall hallow his head that same day." A sin offering is also prescribed in the graver cases of uncleanness, for a leper who has been cleansed (Lev. 14 : 19), a man who has an issue (Lev. 15 : 15), and a woman after childbirth (Lev. 12 : 6, 8), as well as for the uncleanness of a Nazirite (Num. 6 : 11), above mentioned. Apparently similar is the sin offering for the Nazirite after the completion of the time of his vow (Num. 6 : 14). Probably passages such as Num. 19 : 13, 20, where it is said that the unclean person who will not purify himself shall be cut off from the assembly, should not be included directly here, since the conception probably is that the punishment was not so much for the uncleanness as for the persistent disobedience. It is doubtless a result of this earlier conception that moral sin is often spoken of as uncleanness, even by the prophets, as in Isa. 1 : 16; 6 : 5; Jer. 33 : 8; Lam. 4 : 14f. This form of expression probably has come to be used because the earlier conception of sin as ritual, *i. e.*, as uncleanness, was broadened so

as to embrace also moral sins, which then were included under the term uncleanness or defilement. As the prophets use the language, however, it probably does not represent the distinctly prophetic view, but rather the employment of language in common use.

Except in the distinctly ritual portions, however, the Old Testament for the most part presents another view. In harmony with the lofty ethical character of Yahweh, taught in the Old Testament, it is inevitable that there should be an ethical view of sin. It is true, of course, that sin is that which is opposed to the will of Yahweh. But this will is regarded as a comprehensive thing, it embraces all one's relations with his fellow-men, as well as directly with Yahweh. In the teaching of prophets, psalmists, and wisdom writers, therefore, the emphasis is laid upon sins of an ethical nature, injustice, oppression, robbery, murder, etc. And when the direct relation to Yahweh is in mind, the thought is usually not of the details of the ritual, but of the general question of loyalty to Yahweh or rejection of him.

In brief, then, we find in the Old Testament a conception that sin is of a ritual nature, which is

esentially the same as the early common-Semitic conception. This is found chiefly in the Levitical legislation. There are also indications in the Old Testament of an advance from this view to the one found among the Babylonians, that sin, of a ritual nature, may include moral transgressions as well. A further step is taken, however, in which the Old Testament teaching is distinctive: sin is recognized as in principle of an ethical nature, and hence of a fixed character, embracing all possible relations, in harmony with the teaching concerning Yahweh as a God of an ethical character, who cares for all human activities and relations.

II

SALVATION THROUGH SACRIFICE

REDEMPTION, as ordinarily used, means deliverance from sin and its effects: salvation includes this and also the positive blessings that flow from such deliverance. Practically, then, salvation, speaking in common-Semitic terms, means the answer to the question, In what ways can man, who is a sinner, so far remove the effects of sin in relation to the gods that he can obtain and keep their favor? Various answers to this question are found among the Semites; the one common answer is through sacrifice, which will first be considered.

The present discussion is limited to this life, as it is that which is chiefly considered both in the Old Testament and in the literature of the other Semitic nations. The conception of the future life will be treated by itself.

It will be necessary to consider first certain general features of Semitic sacrifices; after that the significance will be discussed.

Place and time of sacrifices. In the earlier Old Testament usage sacrifice was offered in many places. Later the worship was centralized, and sacrifices were required to be offered at one place—the temple at Jerusalem. In the common-Semitic usage there is a measure of centralization of worship, but nothing so definite as in this later Old Testament regulation. Of course, in any polytheistic system there is worship in many places, to different gods. Regularly, however, there was a central point for the worship of each god, the temple at the city where its worship was especially localized. But, in general, any god could also be worshiped in other localities. In Babylonia and Assyria the goddess Ishtar was worshiped with almost equal honor at several cities, although she became thus practically separated into distinct deities. Further, certain tendencies, especially the monarchical, led in Babylonia and Assyria to the building of temples and altars to many other deities around those of the chief god of a prominent city, their subordination being indicated in this way, or to the placing of other images in the temple of the special god of the city. Thus there were no less than thirteen sacred edifices in Lagash used for the worship of as many gods, and in the old

temple in the city of Ashur approximately twenty deities were worshiped.[1]

It is usually thought that centralization of worship among the Hebrews resulted from practical considerations, by reason of the abuses resulting from worship at the "high places." While this may have had some force, it seems evident that centralization was in harmony with the early idea of sacrifice. In this early idea, as we shall see, sacrifice was a clan matter, conducted usually by the whole clan, and doubtless ordinarily at the same place. This communal idea was preserved to a considerable extent in the peace offering, but much less in the burnt offering. Yet, in general, the relation to the community was preserved among the Hebrews more than among the other nations: the sacrifice always had some reference to the national life. Hence, when the unity of the whole nation became prominent, it was natural that this communal side of the worship should be emphasized by its centralization.

Concerning the time and circumstances of sacrifice, little difference is to be observed. In all the Semitic nations sacrifice was both national and individual: the relation between these differ-

[1] Jastrow, "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," pp. 635, 637.

ent forms will be considered in connection with their significance. National sacrifices were offered on any important occasion, such as a feast or special day of any kind. In Babylonia there was daily sacrifice as well as in Israel. This is well established for the cities of Borsippa, Sippar, Kutha, and Nineveh, and probably was practised elsewhere also.[1] Individual sacrifices could evidently be offered at any convenient occasion among all the nations.

In all the nations priests have a prominent part. They are called by the same name among the Hebrews, Arabs, and Phœnicians. Among the Minæans the priests and priestesses are called לוא and לואת, which may be connected with the Hebrew לֵוִי.[2] Among the Arabs alone they have nothing directly to do with the sacrifices, which are offered by the one who brings them. This is doubtless connected with the fact that in Arabia the offering is the pouring out of the blood on the sacred stone, so that it is in reality a part of the act of slaughtering. There the priest was the guardian of the holy place and the one who gave oracles, especially by lot. The priesthood was

[1] Jastrow, "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 667.
[2] Hommel, "*Süd-arabische Chrestomathie*," p. 127.

hereditary. In all the other Semitic nations the offering was ordinarily performed by the priest, with some exceptions in the early Old Testament usage. Little information beyond that just stated is at hand in reference to the Carthaginian priests. In the Old Testament the priesthood was hereditary, in Babylonia at any rate largely so. The two nations had similar regulations concerning the physical perfection of the priests. The chief difference between the Babylonians and the Hebrews was in the wider range of priestly activities among the former people. It was the priests who had charge of incantations and omens, as well as sacrifice, practices which are forbidden in the Old Testament. Those in Babylonia whose work was most like that of the Old Testament prophets were there a branch of the priesthood. In Babylonia the king was regarded as in some sense the head of the priests,[1] as he never was among the Hebrews. Presumably this means that the early prominence of the priests was such that it was from priestly families that the kings came. Yet this preeminence became nominal, the king himself needing the intercession of the priests.[2]

[1] Jastrow, "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 655f.
[2] Jastrow, "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 692.

The power of the priests was very great in Babylonia. This doubtless resulted from the great prominence of ritual which only the priests knew how to perform, and partly from the related reason that the priests were distinctly the educated class.

The materials used in sacrifice have a general similarity among all the nations, although with some variations. Ordinarily the animals sacrificed are clean domestic animals, although not all of these are allowed to be used. The sacrificial animals among the Hebrews were cattle, sheep, goats, turtle-doves, and pigeons. Among the Phœnicians, at least at Carthage and vicinity, they were cattle, sheep, goats, domestic birds, deer (איל), young (?) deer (צרב איל), wild birds (?) (צץ), and game (צר).[1] Among the Babylonians the sacrificial animals included cattle, sheep, goats, gazelles, fish, and birds.[2] The favorite animal sacrifice, however, and the one especially mentioned in the sacrificial regulations which have been found, was the lamb. The sacrificial animals of the Arabs were camels, sheep, and cattle.[3] Camels were also eaten by the Arabs, although neither

[1] Marseilles Tablet, CIS, I, 165.
[2] See especially inscription of Gudea, KB, III, pp. 60-65.
[3] Wellhausen, "*Reste arabischen Heidentums*," 2d ed., p. 115.

eaten nor sacrificed by the Hebrews. Gazelles were also sacrificed by the Arabs, although regarded as an imperfect substitute for a sheep.

Among all the Semitic nations there were bloodless offerings as well. The materials for these in the Old Testament were meal, oil, incense, and wine, together with salt. In Babylonia, they were honey, butter—these two usually mixed —milk, dates, figs, oil, salt, incense, wine of all kinds, water, and perhaps other things.[1] Among the Arabs the principal materials were meal and milk: incense was not used, and oil and wine but rarely.[2] Among the Phœnicians the materials were meal, fruit, oil, incense, milk, and fat.[3]

The general principle seems to have been the same among all the Semitic nations, covering all the sacrifices: the sacrifices were taken from the ordinary food of the people, but probably did not in any case include all articles of ordinary food. There may have been various reasons for the omission of specific articles. Milk is omitted from the Hebrew list alone. Fat is included in the *minha* by the Phœnicians, while in the Old Testament the fat of the intestines is always a

[1] KAT, 3d ed., p. 599f.
[2] Wellhausen, "*Reste arabischen Heidentums*," 2d ed., p. 114; W. Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," 2d ed., p. 220.
[3] CIS, I, 165f.

part of a bloody offering, and is burned upon the altar, so that its use is forbidden as food.[1] Specially notable is the use of honey in the Babylonian ritual, which is expressly forbidden in the Old Testament.[2] This is perhaps an illustration of another principle in the Old Testament regulations, viz., the avoidance of some materials for sacrifice used by the surrounding nations, possibly to remove temptations to idolatry.

The different kinds of sacrifices. The division of sacrifices according to their meaning needs consideration at this point. The animal sacrifices are doubtless earlier than the vegetable, and show more characteristic differences of meaning, although vegetable offerings may sometimes be substituted for animal. In the Old Testament there are two principal types of animal sacrifice, the burnt offering (עוֹלָה) and the peace offering (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים, שֶׁלֶם, זֶבַח). The other sacrifices of the Old Testament are of minor importance in this connection, and need not be discussed particularly here. In the burnt offering practically the whole animal was burnt upon the altar; while the peace offering was a sacrificial meal—most of the animal was eaten in a sacred meal by the offerer and

[1] Lev. 3 : 17. [2] Lev. 2 : 11.

others associated with him. The apparent meaning of the burnt offering was that of a gift to God, but not an ordinary gift—a gift to secure in some way the expiation of sin; while the meaning of the peace offering, apparently, was the fellowship between men and God, and among men, the worshipers.

These two types of sacrifice are found ordinarily among the Semitic nations. The usual sacrifice among the Arabs is of the nature of the peace offering. The other form of sacrifice, the burnt offering, is found in the case of human sacrifices, but it is doubtful whether it is found at all in other cases.[1] Fire was only used with human sacrifices. The altar was a sacred stone where the blood was applied. If any sacrifices corresponding to the burnt offering are found, aside from human sacrifices, the flesh was not burned but left by the altar, and doubtless eaten by wild beasts. There are, however, the two types of Old Testament sacrifices, but the one corresponding to the burnt offering is comparatively uncommon. The inscriptions of the Southern Arabs make little mention of sacrifices. There is thought to be specific evidence of the existence of

[1] W. Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," 2d ed., pp. 229, 386.

the peace offering with the name שלם, as in Hebrew.[1]

It seems clear that the Phœnician Carthaginians had the two kinds corresponding quite closely to the Old Testament.[2] The one corresponding to the Old Testament burnt offering is known as כליל, clearly the Hebrew כָּלִיל, an infrequent term used instead of עוֹלָה for the burnt offering, meaning *whole, holocaust.* The one probably corresponding to the Old Testament peace offering is called צועת. Various conjectures have been made concerning the etymological significance of this word, but none that seem at all conclusive. The disposition of the flesh corresponds partially to that in the Old Testament, as will be seen more fully later. In the כל·ל a portion of the flesh by weight is assigned to the priests; in the צועת certain specified members of the body are given to the priests, and others to the offerer. There is no express mention of fire in these Phœnician inscriptions. It is clearly implied, however, and there is frequent mention of altars. It seems evident that in these sacrifices the portions not expressly mentioned, or most of

[1] Weber, "*Arabien vor dem Islam*," p. 20f; Jeremias, "*Das alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*," 2d ed., p. 433.
[2] CIS, I, 165, 167.

them, are burned. In that case all the כליל was burned except the portion specified for the priests, while it was comparatively a small portion of the צועת that was burned, as will be seen more fully. This makes a general correspondence with the Old Testament. There is also mention of כליל שלם. It seems probable that שלם is Hebrew שֶׁלֶם, but in what way it is used here is doubtful, since צועת, as has been indicated, seems to designate the sacrifice of which שֶׁלֶם is used in Hebrew, and it is uncertain in what way שלם can be connected with כליל. כליל שלם is evidently used as a distinct variety of sacrifice along with the other two, but it is apparently subordinate, since it does not appear in the more detailed statements. It is perhaps a variety of the כליל. There is also mention of two other forms of sacrifice, שצף and חזת,[1] but these are evidently subordinate and of very doubtful meaning, the explanation of Langdon[2] being by no means certain. Langdon takes another word, סוית in לסוית,[3] as designating a holocaust. He considers it the same as the Syriac word for holocaust. Haupt[4] compares with this Syriac word the Babylonian sacrificial term *shumu,* to

[1] CIS, I, 165, l. 11. [2] JBL, XXIII, p. 86.
[3] JBL, XXIII, pp. 81, 89. [4] JBL, XIX, p. 60.

which he gives the meaning *roasted meat.* This explanation of סויה is suggestive, but the inscription in which it is found is so exceedingly fragmentary that no definite conclusion can be reached concerning it. The word זבח is found in Phœnician as a noun as well as a verb, but it has an altogether general meaning, being applied even to bloodless sacrifices.

In Babylonian and Assyrian the word *zibu,* the equivalent of Hebrew זֶבַח, is found only rarely, and with a general meaning, as in Phœnician, including bloodless offerings. The corresponding verb has not been found. The word for animal sacrifice is *niqu.* This was the original word for *libation,* and still retains that meaning, but the signification has been broadened so that it is the common word for animal sacrifice, especially a sacrificial lamb. So far as appears there is only one kind of animal sacrifice among the Assyrians and Babylonians. This resembles the burnt offering more than the peace offering. The offering seems to be entirely given over to the god, although the disposition of it is quite different from the Old Testament regulations. Certain portions, as will be seen more fully later, were regularly presented to the god; and certain portions regu-

larly belonged to the priests. It is not certain that any portions were burned, but this seems to be clearly presumable. In meaning, also, it is similar to the burnt offering, its atoning efficacy is conspicuous, and it is often spoken of as a gift to the god.

Concerning the early idea of Semitic sacrifice, the relative age of the two types, and the development of meaning in the case of each, there is much difference of opinion. In the discussion of this matter, special reference must necessarily be made to the view of W. Robertson Smith,[1] which is essentially as follows, according to the understanding of the present writer.

The early Semitic idea of sacrifice rested upon a primitive conception of the relation of man to deity. Sacrifice was a sacrificial meal, a clan meal, shared by the god of the clan and the clan itself, who were all bound together by physical relationship. This was like a common meal among men related: it strengthened the ties existing between the god and the clan. According to the conception at that time, the food was actually eaten by the god as well as by the men. The sacrificial animal was kindred to the clan and the god,

[1] "Religion of the Semites," 2d ed., *passim*.

i. e., it was a totem animal. Sacrifice was purely a clan matter, not an individual matter.

The early form of sacrifice was thus a peace offering: the other form of sacrifice, the burnt offering, was developed from it through the coming in of the idea that the sacrifice was a gift, and through the feeling of the need of propitiating the favor of the gods. Originally the sacrifice was a joyous occasion, there was very little feeling of guilt; the physical relationship of the god and his worshipers made it unnecessary to do much by way of propitiating him. The idea of a gift came about probably through the growth of individualism. In the early clan idea there was very little individual ownership of property. But in course of time, with increasing civilization and wealth, individual ownership became common. Gifts to the gods, especially of cereals, assumed a prominent position. This naturally tended to the thought that the animal sacrifices were also a gift. The old totem idea also became weakened, so that the early force of the sacrifice was less strongly felt. The increase of civilization, and the disappearance of the old idea of physical relationship to the god, also tended to a cultivation of the sense of guilt. From these various tendencies it

came about that sacrifices were presented frequently as individual gifts for special sins, or in seeking special favors. It was still felt that the victim was sacred, although the original reason was lost or obscured. Then, as an explanation of this sacredness, arose the conception that the victim was a substitute for a human being. With this idea, the flesh was felt to be too sacred to be eaten. Burning the sacrifice was then practised, simply as a means of disposing of the flesh without danger to the worshiper, of which it was dangerous to eat. This took place at first probably outside of the city rather than on the altar. But the significance of the burning was forgotten, and another explanation of it arose. The early idea that the gods ate flesh like men gave place to a somewhat more spiritual conception of them, as a result of which it was felt that more etherealized food was appropriate to them, *i. e.*, liquids and vapor. The blood was at first shared between the god and the worshipers, ultimately it was all given to the god. Hence arose a libation of blood, and later of other liquids. The original altar was a stone upon which the blood was poured out. The burning came to be considered, like the libation, a means of conveying ethereal-

ized food to the gods, in this case in the form of smoke; and then the burning was transferred to the altar where liquids had been offered.

But the peace offering did not remain entirely unchanged. The chief change, however, was in reference to the sacred character of the offering. At first, as has been stated, this was felt to be naturally sacred, because a totem animal. Later, in the burnt offering, the sacredness was still felt, but was differently explained. With the peace offering, however, the emphasis was still laid upon the sacrificial meal, and the sense of the sacredness of the victim was largely lost, so that it could still be eaten. Doubtless this diminution in sacredness arose chiefly from the practical necessity of eating the sacred animals for food. The substitutionary idea doubtless did not enter here, at least not prominently. That is, in the original sacrifice two things were prominent—a sacred animal and a common meal; and there was nothing contradictory in these two factors. But with the loss of the original conception, emphasis on either one led to the obscuration of the other element. Continued emphasis on the sacredness of the animal led, as has been indicated, to burnt offering; on the idea of the meal, to the peace

offering, which retains in general the original conception, but has lost the idea of the sacredness of the victim to such an extent that it is still considered safe to eat the flesh. The general conception of the peace offering is thus fellowship; of the burnt offering, a gift, with strong and increasing emphasis upon the idea of atonement for sin.

Such in brief is the view of W. Robertson Smith. How far it can be accepted in all its details is a question. But to the present writer the general view seems probably correct. It apparently accounts for the facts better than any other view. In particular, the early idea of sacrifice and the development of the two types seem quite in accordance with the habits of thought of primitive peoples.

Two special forms of Old Testament sacrifices which have not been mentioned should here be referred to: the חַטָּאת, *sin offering*, and the אָשָׁם, *guilt offering*. These are usually considered to be, at least in prominent use, the latest and perhaps most characteristic development of the Old Testament sacrifices. Both in form and meaning, however, they are really developments of the burnt offering. They are very similar to each

other. The chief variation of both of them from the ritual of the burnt offering is in the disposition of the body of the animal. In the case of the sin offering the same portions are burned on the altar as in the peace offering, while all the rest of the carcass is burned without the city at the dumping-place of the ashes. In the guilt offering the portions burned on the altar are the same as in the sin offering, but the rest all the priests eat together in a holy place. In accordance with what has been said concerning the development of the burnt offering, it seems probable that the disposition in the case of the sin offering was the earlier custom in the case of the burnt offering. In the case of the guilt offering, there appears to be a different development of the idea of the sacredness of the offering: when it came to be regarded as too sacred for a common meal, it was eaten by the priests solemnly in a holy place, instead of being burned. Both treatments, then, it would seem, are really early features, although perhaps becoming prominent late in Old Testament history. Both emphasize the sacred character of the offering, and thus make prominent the idea of expiation, which they have in common with the burnt offering. They are, then, to be

regarded as really varieties of the burnt offering.

A subordinate form of sacrifice is the libation. This is regularly an accompaniment of other offerings. It was probably originally of blood, as has already been suggested. There is no significant difference among the various Semitic nations, except that among the Arabs it was relatively more important than with any other nation, it being there, on account of the infrequency of fire offerings, ordinarily the essential godward feature of animal sacrifice. It was also very common among the Assyrians and Babylonians.

The incense offering is also in general a subordinate form. This doubtless arose from the same general idea as that found in the later explanation of the burning of sacrifices, viz., that food was conveyed to the gods in an acceptable etherealized form in this way. Incense offering is found among all the Semitic nations, except the Arabs; it is found among the Southern Arabs. Its absence among the Arabs has been considered strange. Doubtless, however, in accordance with what has just been said, it is to be connected with the fact that fire was not ordinarily used in their sacrifices. In Babylonia and Assyria, on the other hand, this form of offering was very com-

mon, apparently the most prominent feature of the sacrifices.

The bloodless offerings, or meal offerings, may be briefly treated here. These are found among all the Semitic nations. In the Old Testament they consist essentially, in the most common form, of meal and oil mingled. These elements are found in general among the other nations, with some additions. It should be noted that these offerings are not sacrifices in the same sense as the animal sacrifices, they are simply, in their essence, a form of tribute; the common Hebrew word for them, מִנְחָה, means *a gift*. Their treatment is in harmony with this idea of tribute. The act of the offerer is simply to bring them: they are wholly given over to God—a part is burned on the altar, the rest belongs to the priests as a whole, not to the ministering priest alone. They probably came originally from the first-fruits. But they did not remain entirely unaffected by the influence of the animal sacrifices. To a certain extent they might be substituted for animal sacrifices by the poor. This was the case with the burnt offering and sin offering; it is not mentioned in the case of the guilt offering, although that would be expected from the analogy of the sin offering. The

substitution did not take place in the case of the peace offering, evidently because the fundamental ideas of the two were entirely at variance. When substituted, however, these bloodless offerings have no independent significance of their own, but take that of the sacrifice for which they are a substitute.

The showbread—twelve loaves placed before Yahweh and renewed every week—are a form of sacrifice. They have their parallel in the similar custom of the Babylonians and Assyrians of placing loaves before the gods when sacrificing. These loaves were twelve in number or a multiple of twelve, often three times twelve.[1] These loaves in the Old Testament are called לֶחֶם פָּנִים, *bread of face;* whether the Babylonian are called by the corresponding term *akal panu* is not entirely certain.[2]

Prominent details of the regulations. The Old Testament sacrifice of cattle, sheep, or goat is usually a male. This is demanded in the case of the burnt offering and the guilt offering, and also in the case of the sin offering for priest, ruler, or the whole people. For the sin offering for an or-

[1] Zimmern, "*Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion,*" p. 95f.
[2] See Zimmern, KAT, 3d ed., p. 600.

dinary individual a female is required, while for the peace offering it may be male or female. It can hardly be doubted that the male is considered superior, and so is insisted upon in general when the special sanctity of the victim is in mind. This accounts for the relaxation of the regulation in the case of the peace offering, but the isolated exception in the sin offering is anomalous. Among the Babylonians, as well, the animal was usually a male, although females were also used.[1] No specific regulation that the sacrifice shall be a male is to be found in the other religions, although among the sacrificial animals specified on the Marseilles tablet are אלף, *ox*, and יבל, *ram*.

The Old Testament generally provides that the animal for sacrifice shall be without blemish, תָּמִים. The same provision is found in the Babylonian regulations, the corresponding word being *shalmu*.[2] This does not seem to be an express regulation in the material available among the other nations.

The Babylonian, as well as the Old Testament, regulations provide that the sacrifice shall be seasoned with salt.[3]

[1] Jeremias, "*Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*," 2d ed., p. 429.
[2] Zimmern, KAT, 3d ed., p. 598.
[3] Zimmern, KAT. 3d ed., p. 598.

In the Old Testament the blood is very prominent, because it is regarded as the life. This appears clearly in such passages as Lev. 17 : 11: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." The blood has a conspicuous place in the Old Testament ritual of the sacrifices. In the burnt offering, peace offering, and guilt offering, it is sprinkled round about upon the altar of burnt offering, except that in the case of birds in the burnt offering it is drained out upon the side of the altar. In the case of the sin offering for a priest or for the whole people, the blood is to be sprinkled seven times before Yahweh before the veil of the sanctuary, then some put upon the horns of the altar of incense, and the rest poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering. The blood of a sin offering for a ruler or for an ordinary person is to be treated in the same way, except that the first part, the sprinkling, is omitted. In the case of a bird as a sin offering for an ordinary person, however, it is provided that the priest shall sprinkle of the blood upon the side of the altar of burnt offering, and drain out the re-

mainder at the base of the altar. In Arabia the treatment of the blood was the sacrifice, as has already been indicated. There it was poured out upon the sacred stone which formed the altar. There is no express mention of blood in the Carthaginian regulations. In Babylonia the blood is evidently of very minor significance: it has been found mentioned in only two passages.[1] Among the Canaanites it is thought that sacrificial blood has been found on certain pillars.[2]

In the Old Testament regulations for the burnt offering all the animal except the skin is to be burned on the altar: the skin goes to the priest. In the sacrifice of a bird, however, the crop and feathers are thrown aside and not burned. In the case of the sin offering, all the intestinal fat and the kidneys, and also the fat tail of a lamb, are burned on the altar; and all the rest of the body is burned outside the city, where the ashes are poured out. In the guilt offering, the portion burned is the same as with the sin offering, while the flesh is eaten by all the priests in a holy place. In the case of the peace offering, the portion burned is the same as with the sin offer-

[1] See KAT, 3d ed., p. 599.
[2] Jeremias, *"Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients,"* 2d ed., p. 317.

ing, the breast and the right shoulder are, in P, the portion of the priests, while all the rest of the flesh is used for a sacrificial meal by the offerer and others.

Among the Arabs, the burnt offering is perhaps represented only by the human sacrifices; there the victim is burned entire. In their ordinary sacrifices, corresponding to the peace offering, the flesh, without specially excluding the fat, is eaten as a sacrificial meal. Among the Carthaginians, in the Marseilles tablet, the priests receive a fee of money, varying according to the value of the animal—the same for any kind of sacrifice. Besides this, in the כליל, corresponding to the burnt offering, the priests receive a certain weight of flesh of the larger animals, three hundred shekels weight for an ox, and one hundred and fifty for a calf or deer. The rest was presumably burned. In the case of the צועת, corresponding to the peace offering, the priests receive certain portions called קצרת and יצלת, whose meaning is uncertain. The skin, the שלבם, meaning uncertain, the feet, and the rest of the flesh go to the offerer. In another inscription,[1] the details of the regulations vary considerably.

[1] CIS, I, 167.

In the Babylonian regulations it is frequently specified that the following portions of the animal are to be given to the god: *imittu,* right shoulder or right thigh; *hinsa,* loins; *shume,* probably roasted flesh; and *silqu,* probably boiled flesh. The portions that go to the priest are not usually mentioned. In the inscription of Nabuapaliddin,[1] however, they are given as follows: *sunu,* loins; *mashku,* hide; *arkatu,* rump; *buane,* tendons; *mishil karshi,* half of the abdominal viscera; *mishil qirbi,* half of the thoracic viscera; two *qursinnu,* legs; *me seri,* a pot of broth.[2]

In the Old Testament regulations it is generally specified that the offerer is to lay his hand upon the head of the victim, and to slay it. Neither of these regulations, however, is given with the guilt offering; while with the sin offering for the whole people it is the elders of the congregation who lay on their hands, and it is not specified who kills the victim. The Babylonian regulations give no directions concerning the slaying, but in one inscription it is specified that the offerer shall hold the sheep that is sacrificed.[3]

The meaning of the sacrifices. The treatment

[1] Col. V, ll. 9-18, KB, III, 1, p. 180f.
[2] See Haupt, JBL, XIX, p. 60.
[3] Zimmern, "*Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion,*" *a*, ll., 74, 155, pp. 101, 107.

of external features thus far shows that the two principal Old Testament sacrifices are found for the most part among the other Semitic nations, and that there are very many resemblances in details. It can hardly be doubted that there is great similarity in the meaning as well. The early meaning as well as form was doubtless the same in all Semitic sacrifices, as has been seen. But changes from the original form and meaning evidently took place previous to the branching off of any of the Semitic nations from the common stock. Especially the development of the burnt offering from the original peace offering, together with some changes in the latter, were clearly antecedent to the separation. Hence all this precedes the distinctive development of any of these nations. In the long course of the development of individual nations, however, it seems inevitable that the meaning as well as form has changed considerably. These changes largely depended upon the extent to which the earlier physical conception of the gods had disappeared. It was no doubt modified somewhat among all the nations. This is seen, *e. g.*, in the general substitution of liquids and smoke for flesh as the sacrificial food of the gods. Inasmuch as the physical nature of the gods was

still accepted, however, to a certain extent by all the Semitic nations, aside from the Hebrews, it seems evident that a physical conception of sacrifice must have continued to prevail among all, unless the Hebrews are an exception. That is, the sacrifices were still considered to be the food of the gods, and their meaning was based upon that idea. The general meaning, then, among these nations, of the two types of sacrifices would be that already indicated—that the peace offering expresses and promotes fellowship already existing with the gods, the burnt offering secures their favor which has been more or less interrupted by sin. There is really nothing more definite than this in the teachings of these nations. The Babylonians evidently gave to the sacrifice a certain magical efficacy, in accordance with the physical conception, as the sacrificial ritual was a part of the ritual of incantation.[1]

To determine the Old Testament meaning of the sacrifices, it is necessary to keep in mind their history and original significance. Perhaps the first question is whether the physical conception of the effect of sacrifice remains at all in the Old

[1] See especially Zimmern, "*Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion*," *passim*.

Testament. There is language used which seems to have that meaning. Not infrequently the sacrifices are called the "bread of God" (לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים). It is often said, as in Gen. 8 : 21 : "And Yahweh smelled the sweet savor." In Ps. 50 : 12f Yahweh refers to sacrifices in these words : "If I were hungry, I would not tell thee; for the world is mine and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?" verses which are couched in physical language, yet which repudiate the thought of sacrifices as the food of Yahweh. In the general Old Testament representation, however, as has been seen, Yahweh is distinctly spiritual; therefore, it is hardly possible to understand these phrases as conveying a real physical meaning. Hence these expressions can naturally be regarded as partly a preservation of the phraseology of an earlier time: this seems to be especially true of language like the "bread of God." Partly also, doubtless, they are to be regarded as anthropomorphism which is inseparable from any representation of God, and which would be suggested by the nature of sacrifice.

If, however, the physical conception of the sacrifices has been lost among the Hebrews, what

is the meaning which they retain? It is probable that the general meaning has been retained. That is, the peace offering expresses and promotes fellowship with Yahweh; the burnt offering is a gift by which his favor is obtained, which had been lost by sin. The peace offering differs but very slightly from the corresponding sacrifices among the Arabs and Carthaginians. The burnt offering, also, has the same general meaning as the corresponding sacrifice among the Arabs, Carthaginians, and Babylonians. If there is any material difference it is in a greater emphasis in the Old Testament upon the expiation of sin. Two things are sometimes thought to indicate this. One is the existence of the sin offering and guilt offering, which are thought to be a late development, carrying the idea of expiation for sin to a higher point than the burnt offering. But the details of the ritual of these two offerings, as already indicated, in their variation from the burnt offering, present features that are early rather than late. Hence, whatever the time of their historical appearance, they are not to be regarded as developments from the burnt offering, and thus a higher form of that; but rather as collateral variations in the general development of the burnt-

offering type of sacrifice, and hence of no greater significance, so far as the expiation of sin is concerned, than the burnt offering itself. The other thing is the relatively great importance of the blood in the Old Testament ritual, which has already been noted in general. Expiation of sins is specifically assigned to the blood, as in Lev. 17 : 11 : "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." Yet the treatment of the blood was the same in the peace offering and the burnt offering, while it is only in a very general way, in connection with other sacrifices, that atonement is attributed to the peace offering, not when it is treated specifically by itself. It seems evident that the blood is not thought of as an isolated matter entirely, but rather that the type of sacrifice is thought of as a whole, although its atoning efficacy is due to the blood. It is doubtful, therefore, if the emphasis upon the blood is to be regarded as indicating a materially greater emphasis upon the expiation of sin than is to be found elsewhere. It seems more probable that the expiation, which in the other Semitic religions is attributed in general to the

life, is here specially connected with the blood, as the seat of life.

The expiation of sin is regularly expressed in the Old Testament by the word כִּפֶּר. This word is used several times of the burnt offering, although more frequently of the sin offering and guilt offering. This word כִּפֶּר means in some way to make atonement for sin. Besides its use in the ritual portions of the Old Testament in connection with sacrifice, it is used in the non-ritual portions with no relation to them, as will be seen. In the ritual use, the priest is usually the subject of the verb, and it is followed by a preposition governing ordinarily the person affected, while the sacrifices are spoken of as the means. Thus it is said that the officiating priest makes atonement for some one by means of sacrifice. The sins for which atonement is made are also sometimes mentioned. This word is used, with the same general meaning as in Hebrew, in Babylonian, Aramaic, and Arabic, all in the intensive stem. There are two prevalent views concerning the original meaning of the word. One is that it was *to cover, hide,* which is the meaning of the Arabic word in the simple stem. The other view is that it was *to wash away,* which is the meaning

of the Syriac word in the simple stem, and is also found as a meaning of the Babylonian.[1] The occurrence of the latter meaning in the two languages, Babylonian and Syriac, gives a presumption in favor of that as the original meaning of the root. This meaning also makes it easier to think of some tangible idea as in mind in the use of the word, and to trace the development of thought, and is probably to be accepted. Mention should also be made, however, of the view often held that כִּפֶּר is to be regarded as a denominative from כֹּפֶר, *ransom*.[2] This does not take into account sufficiently the Babylonian usage, and in general seems less in accord with primitive ideas than the view here presented. The view of Schrank[3] that the early meaning of the Babylonian word was of a medical nature, *to besmear* ("bestreichen"), seems based upon no sufficient evidence, although there may be a distinct root having some such meaning. The origin of the usage before us, then, on the view accepted, was in the thought of washing away ritual uncleanness, which was done at first by water in the purifica-

[1] See KAT, 3d ed., p. 601; Morgenstern, "The Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion," p. 44.

[2] As, *e. g.*, in *Siegfried und Stade, Hebräisches Wörterbuch;* H. P. Smith, AJTh, X, p. 412; J. M. P. Smith, "Biblical World," XXXI, p. 26 seq.

[3] "*Babylonische Sühnriten*," p. 81 seq.

tion ceremonies; and then the application was broadened to include any ceremony for ritual purification. This is the meaning which the word has regularly in the Babylonian ritual tablets, to wash away ceremonial uncleanness. In the Old Testament ritual use, also, the meaning is substantially the same. In these passages sin is thought of as of a ritual nature, and it is the removal of sin as uncleanness that is in mind. Hence, in the use before us, in connection with sacrifices, the word has a ritual significance; it denotes the removal of ritual sin, regarded as uncleanness.

It is sometimes thought that the Hebrew כִּפֶּר, at least in its ritual use, has been borrowed from the Babylonian *kuppuru*. Thus Zimmern speaks of "*dieses im babylonischen Sühneritual als terminus technicus verwendte kuppuru,*" and says "*Weiter aber ist sehr wahrscheinlich, das hebr.* כִּפֶּר, *wenigstens als specifisch kultustechnischer Ausdruck in der Bed. 'sühnen,' nicht genuin hebräisch ist, sondern erst auf Grund des babylonischen kultustechnischen Gebrauches von kuppuru in Aufnahme gekommen ist.*" [1] But this is improbable. There seems no reason to separate materially between the ritual and non-ritual meanings of

[1] KAT, 3d ed., p. 601f.

כִּפֶּר, and there is no question that the word, at least in the non-ritual use, was employed before the Babylonian exile, at which time the borrowing could most naturally take place.

Is it a Semitic teaching that the victim in sacrifice is a substitute for a human being, the guilty party? The most definite statement of this idea is found among the Babylonians. Thus it is said,[1] "The lamb, the object of exchange for a man, the lamb he [the priest] gives for his life. The head of the lamb he gives for the head of the man, the neck of the lamb he gives for the neck of the man, the breast of the lamb he gives for the breast of the man." Similar statements are found elsewhere.[2] This, however, is no regular part of the sacrificial ritual, and would seem to have no prominent place in the Babylonian meaning of the sacrifice. The detailed identification, further, suggests that we have here a development along the line of magic, suggested by the common ideas of witchcraft, in which actions of the witch or the one performing an incantation against a witch affected the particular part involved in the action.

[1] See KAT, 3d ed., p. 597.
[2] See especially Jeremias, "*Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*," 2d ed., p. 368f.

In the Old Testament there is no clear statement of substitution. The emphasis upon the blood, as atoning by virtue of the life, is sometimes thought to suggest it, as indicating that the blood represents the life given for the life of the man. The force of this argument is weakened, however, by the fact that the specific offenses for which sacrifices are offered are not those for which there is a death penalty, but less serious offenses. Another argument is drawn from some statements about the sin offering. The treatment of the sin offering on the day of Atonement seems to indicate that it was regarded as very similar to the goat "for Azazel," see especially Lev. 16 : 26 in comparison with ver. 28. The goat "for Azazel," however, was regarded as bearing the sins of the people (Lev. 16 : 21), which is thought to make it probable that the sin offering was so regarded, and hence as a substitute for man. The argument, however, is indirect and uncertain.

Substitution appears in the case of the ram offered in place of Isaac, and also in the redemption of firstborn sons, although the latter practice is not definitely sacrificial. The former case is exceptional, and doubtless to be connected with

the prevailing ideas in reference to human sacrifices. The Old Testament, then, has no clear teaching that the sacrifice is substitutionary, and the meaning of the sacrifices is really opposed to that idea.

Wherever human sacrifices are found, they doubtless show that animal sacrifices are regarded as substitutes for human beings, human sacrifice being offered as the most efficacious sacrifice. In the Semitic world, human sacrifices were especially common among the Canaanites.[1] The substitutionary idea, as has already been noted, is a late idea in the development of the sacrifices, having nothing to do with their fundamental significance.

There remains for consideration the meaning of the Old Testament sin offering and guilt offering. The general meaning of these, as has already been indicated, is probably the same as of the burnt offering, so that really they are only varieties of that. In statement they are more directly connected with the removal of sin and iniquity than is the burnt offering. The details of the ritual, so far as they pertain to the disposition of the flesh, can hardly be considered to give a fundamentally

[1] Sellin, "*Die Ertrag der Ausgrabungen im Orient*," p. 28 seq.

different meaning from that of the burnt offering, as has been indicated. The treatment of the blood in the guilt offering is the same as in the burnt offering. The variation in reference to the blood in the sin offering probably has no great significance, except the sprinkling of the blood before Yahweh in front of the veil of the sanctuary, which evidently is to be thought of as bringing the atoning efficacy of the blood more directly before Yahweh. This fact, and also the more frequent use of כִּפֶּר in connection with the sin offering and guilt offering than with the burnt offering, may indicate variations from the burnt offering in the direction of greater intensity in atoning efficacy; but that difference in significance, if any, is slight.

The scope of these two sacrifices is somewhat different from that of the burnt offering. Both have reference in general to *specific* offenses, while apparently the burnt offering is for sins which are not known specifically. It is reasonably clear that the guilt offering is for sins for which reparation can be made to the injured party; while the sin offering is for cases where such reparation cannot be made, including some ceremonial offenses. But this recognition of specific individual sins as such does not mark any great advance in

the idea of sin beyond the more general acknowledgment of sinfulness and sinful acts found in the burnt offering.

The relation of sacrifices to the nation and the individual should be noted. In its early significance, as we have seen, sacrifice was a clan matter. Later the individual idea arose, especially in connection with the type of sacrifice represented by the burnt offering. The peace offering retained generally its communal character. It was not, however, necessarily a clan matter, but in its very nature it did imply that the sacrificial meal was shared by a group: it did not become fully an individual thing, although often brought by an individual. The burnt offering and sin offering among the Hebrews might be for the nation or for individuals; the guilt offering, so far as appears, was only individual. Among the other Semitic nations, also, it is reasonably clear that the burnt offering might be either individual or national. The Carthaginian regulations are not very explicit; they imply, however, individual offerings in speaking of the offerer (בעל זבח), in relation probably to each class of sacrifices. That there were also community sacrifices of some kind may be presumed. Among the Babylonians the

daily sacrifices, at any rate, were clearly community sacrifices. That there were also individual sacrifices is shown by the ritual, which speaks of the offerer (*bel niqe*). In Babylonia, however, it seems evident that the sacrificial ritual often had in mind the king, as head of the State, for he is frequently mentioned in the ritual tablets as the object of the rites.

So far as has yet been stated, then, the relation of the sacrifices to individuals or communities was similar among all the Semitic nations. In another point, however, the Hebrew conception differed greatly from the thought elsewhere, although based upon the common conception. Sacrifice, we have seen, is essentially a clan matter; every one partaking of it is of necessity a member of the clan in good standing. When the burnt offering has been developed, the fundamental position is still the same; it is a clan matter in this sense, that only a member of the clan has a right to offer it. The sins for which the atoning sacrifice is offered are not sufficiently serious to impair one's relation to the clan and to the god of the clan: if they were sufficient for that, sacrifice could not atone for them. In this early conception, the sins which did thus affect one's stand-

ing in the clan were serious offenses directed against it, materially injuring the life of the clan. One who had committed a sin of this kind had forfeited his right as a member of the clan; only two courses were then possible, death or banishment. In harmony with these ideas, we find that among the Arabs the killing of a fellow-tribesman was the great sin. This, even if unintentional, was punished by death or expulsion from the tribe.[1] These general ideas have been expanded in the Old Testament. The relation of the Hebrews is not that of natural consanguinity with Yahweh, but they are in covenant relation with him. The sacrifices presuppose the covenant relation, and they are only for those in good standing in this relation. The sins for which they atone are sins that do not seriously affect this covenant relation, and their effect is fully to restore one's standing in the theocracy. They have to do, then, with the individual in his national relation, not with the individual purely as such.

But the early conception of the difference between the two classes of sins has been materially modified and developed in the Old Testament. The serious sins here are not sins against the tribe

[1] W. Robertson Smith, "Religion of the Semites," 2d ed., p. 420.

in which a common physical life with the god is seen, they are sins against the God of the covenant, sins which vitally affect one's relation to Yahweh. These are sins of deliberate purpose, sins which show rebellion against God; for such sins the sacrifices make no provision. This distinction is most clearly stated in certain passages of P, especially in Num. 15 : 27-31. Here the sins of deliberate purpose for which the sacrifices make no provision are characterized as done " with a high hand," בְּיָד רָמָה. The sins for which the sacrifices make provision are sins done " unwittingly," בִּשְׁגָגָה. This actually means *by mistake, error.* Its real significance evidently is, sins done through ignorance, inadvertence, or ordinary human frailty, which do not show a deliberate departure from God. The sins for which the burnt offering, sin offering, and guilt offering are offered are sins described as of the latter kind, done unwittingly. Here are included ordinarily all ritual sins, as well as minor ethical sins. The sins committed with a high hand leave one directly in relation with God, to be dealt with in punishment or mercy. For such sins the ordinary punishment was death, inflicted by God, which is undoubtedly meant by the phrase in Num. 15 :

30, "that soul shall be cut off from among his people." This limitation of the sphere of efficacy of sacrifices, while in principle recognized from early times, yet practically goes far beyond any limitations among the other Semitic nations, and is a most significant fact in relation to Old Testament sacrifice.

III

SALVATION THROUGH INCANTATION

THE subject of this chapter is one concerning which there is teaching only in the Babylonian ritual, not in that of the Arabs or Carthaginians, so far as material is available. In the Old Testament there is not merely the absence of teaching, but direct prohibition of such things, as will be seen.

In Babylonia incantation is very conspicuous. The general conception is that there are many subordinate evil spirits, demons, who are to be called evil simply in the sense that they are malevolent toward men. These cause sickness, disaster, and death. They are, of course, less powerful than the gods in the fuller sense, so that in a general way they are somewhat under the control of the latter. The incantations are addressed, therefore, both to the demons themselves and to the gods. The incantation to the demon, if done in the right way, has a direct magical power to deliver the individual from his power. The in-

cantation to the god, if correctly performed, necessarily enlists his aid in overcoming the power of the demon. These incantations were doubtless an early part of the religious literature at all the temples, and hence contained references to various gods in different regions. The incantation texts that have been found, however, show to a larger extent than the other religious literature the result of the combining of material from different places, since they often enumerate very many distinct gods, although some of the gods seem to be more prominent than others in this incantation literature. This literature stands also in close connection with the sacrificial ritual, and with prayers and hymns. That is, to most, if not all, religious acts there was given to some extent a magical power; if properly performed, they had a necessary value. The prayers, psalms, and hymns have ordinarily some words indicating their magical use. It seems probable, however, that this is often a later addition, adapting to such use a composition originally not so intended. It cannot be affirmed, therefore, that all approach to the gods by the Babylonians was along the lines either of sacrifice or incantation; but this, at any rate, was usually the case. In general, therefore,

it would seem that salvation by incantation was the most popular and efficacious method in the estimation of the Babylonians. The Babylonian conception of sin, already discussed, needs to be kept in mind in this connection. Sin was to be determined by its results; it was disaster of some kind that indicated that sin had been committed. The conception of sin was thus external, and its removal could be effected by superficial means as well. Sin was known by its effects; to remove the effects was to remove the sin. But this conception left the determination of the sin an uncertain matter, and also the determination of the god or spirit that was directly affected by the sin, and hence had caused the misfortune. This made the incantations vague and comprehensive. They consist largely of enumeration of all conceivable sins, and calling upon all possible gods and spirits for relief. Jastrow says,[1] "The enumeration of the causes for the suffering constitutes in fact a part of the incantation. The mention of the real cause in the long list—and the list aims to be exhaustive, so that the exorciser may strike the real cause—goes a long way toward ensuring the departure of the evil spirit. And if, besides stri-

[1] "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 292.

king the real cause, the exorciser is fortunate enough in his enumeration of the various gods, goddesses, and spirits to call by name upon the *right* god or spirit, the one who has the power over the demon in question, his object is achieved."

The attitude of the Old Testament toward all this is that none of its teaching suggests any such way of salvation, through incantation. It has been thought that certain details of the Old Testament regulations embody practices which have a somewhat magical cast, as, *e. g.*, the bitter water of jealousy, and doubtless this should be granted. But these are only minor details, and do not represent the fully developed Old Testament teaching. In general, the Old Testament directly disapproves of everything of the kind. This finds emphatic expression in the eighteenth chapter of Deuteronomy. There eleven classes of magical workers are mentioned and their practices forbidden. It is said (Deut. 18 : 12, 14), "For whosoever doeth these things is an abomination unto Jehovah." "For these nations, that thou shalt dispossess, hearken unto them that practise augury, and unto diviners; but as for thee, Jehovah thy God hath not suffered thee so to do."

IV

SALVATION IN OTHER WAYS

IN teaching salvation apart from the ways already mentioned, the Old Testament stands practically alone, here going beyond any teachings of the other Semitic religions. It is probable, as has already been mentioned, that some of the Babylonian prayers were composed as the expression of a direct appeal for divine help and favor; but generally such appeals had a magical use. And, of course, in all the religions, gifts to the gods were a regular feature. But these gifts were largely regarded as fulfilling one's obligations to deity, and were not directly a means of securing favor so much as their absence provoked divine displeasure. Also, in their efficacy, they are to be considered as similar to sacrifices, inasmuch as these have come to be considered gifts. But, generally, neither direct prayers nor gifts can avail in the removal of the barrier between gods and men caused by sin. Hence the general statement will hold that among the Sem-

itic nations, aside from the Hebrews, ordinarily salvation came only through sacrifice or magic.

In order to gain an adequate idea of the Old Testament conception of salvation apart from sacrifice, it will be necessary to consider the matter somewhat fully, and with reference to the development of thought in the Old Testament. This Old Testament teaching is closely connected with the limitation in the scope of sacrifice already mentioned, that sins done by inadvertence, בִּשְׁגָגָה, could be atoned for by sacrifice, but for other sins done with a high hand, בְּיָד רָמָה, no provision existed in the sacrificial system. This distinction between the two classes of sins was true alike of national sins and individual sins. But the distinction, as has been indicated, is fully formulated only in P. In the early chapters of Leviticus, sins of inadvertence are several times referred to; while both classes of sins are spoken of in their relation in Num. 15 : 22-31. Before comparing this teaching with that of other portions of the Old Testament, it will be well to refer briefly to the age of this teaching. It is now frequently held that P, not only in time of composition but in substance of teaching, is postexilic, belonging to the time shortly before Nehemiah. In har-

mony with this idea, it is also held that the post-exilic period was characterized by a regard for sacrificial and ritual observances that went far beyond anything in preexilic times. It is no part of the purpose of the writer to discuss the time of composition of P. It is, however, proper to say that in his view a considerable portion, at any rate, of the material in P must be preexilic, including much of the sacrificial material. The testimony of the preexilic prophets indicates a prominence of sacrifices in the popular mind certainly not exceeded by anything after the exile. And surely a great prominence of ritual ideas in early times would be, it seems, inevitable in view of the predominance of such ideas in the early Semitic conceptions. The teaching of P everywhere that the sacrifice was efficacious as an *opus operatum* seems far more like an early Old Testament teaching than like one of the latest, after prophets and psalmists had emphasized the importance of moral acts, and even of the inner life. In relation to the specific distinction between the two classes of sins that is before us, it seems inevitable that in substance it must have been held from an early period of the distinctive Hebrew development. We have already seen that in principle it is in

harmony with the early Semitic ideas. And it is clear that there was some limitation to the efficacy of sacrifice. This is seen nationally, *e. g.*, in the incident of the golden calf (Exod. 32), for the most part assigned to E. Here, in the case of national rebellion against Yahweh, there is no thought of sacrifice; the sin was followed first by punishment and then by mercy and forgiveness. In an individual application, it is seen in the case cited in Exod. 21 : 14, in the Book of the Covenant, "If a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor, to slay him with guile; thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die." Here the thought is doubtless chiefly of the altar as a sanctuary, but that in itself clearly implies that a sacrifice upon the altar would be of no avail to win the favor of Yahweh.

On the various grounds assigned, then, it seems reasonably clear to the writer that the distinction in the treatment of the two classes of sins, stated explicitly in Num. 15, is one which, in substance, was known from an early period in the Old Testament history, and which was therefore familiar to the Old Testament writers generally. This early conception, it may be repeated, was that the sacrifices atoned only for sins of ignorance or inad-

vertence of nation or individual, but atoned for these necessarily. They did not directly regard the attitude of mind of the offerer, although something was implied concerning this by the fact that he was in covenant relation with God. For sins done with a high hand, prompted by rebellion against Yahweh, no atonement through sacrifice was possible; these put one outside of the covenant, the regular punishment being death: "that soul shall be cut off from among his people" (Num. 15 : 30). Death was not inflicted, however, by ordinary human instrumentality, but by the direction of God or his special visitation, as in the incident cited (Exod. 32; see also Num. 15 : 32-36; and 25).[1] But even in these cases mercy was often extended, sometimes after punishment, and sometimes without it, as many events in the national history indicate. The distinction between the two classes of sins, while rigid in principle, was doubtless somewhat elastic in application; *i. e.*, no *exhaustive* classification is anywhere made of the sins which belong in the two categories respectively.

Let us now examine the attitude of the pro-

[1] See especially the discussion of Davidson, "The Theology of the Old Testament," p. 323.

phetic writings, the psalms, and the wisdom literature toward sacrifice. For the sake of clearness it may be summarily stated at this point that, in the writer's view, their attitude does not differ greatly from that already indicated. The distinction between the two classes of sins appears clearly, and a recognition of this helps greatly in understanding the apparently contradictory statements. Beyond this, it is principally to be noted that sacrifices are often spoken of favorably in a general way as an established institution, more especially with a national reference. There is no thought of their abolition; in fact, the existence and prosperity of the nation imply sacrifice, the daily sacrifices being prominently in mind. In this generally favorable way, as a national institution, sacrifices are mentioned in Hosea 3 : 4; 9 : 4; Jer. 33 : 18; Isa. 43 : 23f; Mal. 1 : 7-10; 3 : 3f; Joel 1 : 9, 13; 2 : 14; Dan. 9 : 27; Ps. 51 : 19; 66 : 13, 15; 96 : 8. Individual offerings are spoken of, but in the same general way as an established institution, in Isa. 19 : 21; Jer. 17 : 26; 33 : 11; Prov. 7 : 14; 17 : 1. They are spoken of with distinct approval in Ezek. 20 : 40; Isa. 56 : 7; Ps. 54 : 6; 56 : 12; 107 : 22; 116 : 17; 118 : 27; in most cases with special reference to the

thank offering. In Eccl. 9 : 2, the man "who sacrifices" is evidently a description of the religious man. In Ps. 20 : 3; Job 1 : 5; and 42 : 8, the efficacy of sacrifices is recognized, although in the last case only partially, the intercession of Job being also needed. Of course, also, in the latter part of Ezekiel sacrifices are spoken of with approval, and many ritual directions are given. Other passages might be added to those thus given, chiefly those in which the references are less direct.

In this connection reference should be made to a view which finds frequent expression at the present time. This is that some of the prophets and psalmists in the earlier time entirely rejected sacrifices, especially, as usually stated, the preexilic prophets; while later the prophets as well as others recognized the validity of sacrifices. The most marked divergence of this view from the one above given is in reference to the teaching of the preexilic prophets.

In answer, two things especially may be said. One is that the prophetic *denunciations* of sacrifice do not contemplate the *abolition* of the system. These denunciations are numerous, as will be seen later, but they are regularly of sacrifices as of-

fered by the wicked. This connection is made clear and explicit, so that it is very evident that it is sacrifices as offered in the time of the prophets that are in mind. Hence there is no ground for saying that any preexilic prophet entirely rejected sacrifices as such. The other thing to be noted is that several of the preexilic prophets, including those most prominent, expressly speak in favorable terms of sacrifices. Passages showing this have already been cited, viz., Hosea 3 : 4; 9 : 4; Isa. 19 : 21; Jer. 17 : 26; 33 : 11, 18. The genuineness of all these passages in Jeremiah is not certain, although they are accepted by most. But in any case it will hardly be claimed that not any of them are genuine.

It should be added, however, that a comparison between the priestly legislation and the other writings shows a frequent difference of emphasis. In the non-ritual writings the emphasis is ordinarily not upon the efficacy of sacrifice, but upon the limitation in its efficacy. It is this especially which gives the impression of a marked variation in the teachings.

We pass to a somewhat more detailed consideration of certain passages which speak unfavorably of sacrifices. In some it is said that in

the particular cases in question the sacrifices are unacceptable on account of sin, as Amos 4 : 4f; Hosea 4 : 13f, 19; 8 : 13; Jer. 6 : 20; Prov. 15 : 8; 21 : 27. The precise way in which they are affected by sin is not made clear; it might seem at first that the teaching is here found that a right attitude of mind is essential for the acceptance of sacrifice, which has not been directly taught in anything yet noted. But there seems to be nothing to suggest that idea. Rather, when viewed in the light of their times and circumstances, these passages indicate that the reference is to sacrifices offered in cases that are outside of the sphere of sacrifice, and are thus entirely in harmony with the distinction between the two classes of sins already noted. The wicked here, who offer the unacceptable sacrifices, are those who have sinned with a high hand; they have committed offenses which cannot be atoned for by sacrifice. This is evidently the thought even in the strong language of Isa. 66 : 3f, which is addressed to sinners, " He that killeth an ox is as he that slayeth a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as he that breaketh a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as he that offereth swine's blood; he that burneth frankincense, as he that blesseth an idol.

Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations: I also will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because when I called, none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear: but they did that which was evil in mine eyes, and chose that wherein I delighted not."

In other passages the same thought is expressed, with something more. These sinners are not only outside of the scope of sacrifices, but, as implied by that fact, their proper punishment is death. That punishment, however, in the mercy of God, may be averted by repentance, of which the best evidence is a changed life. In these passages, then, the thought is not, as it is often considered, that the performance of moral acts is to be regarded as directly taking the place of sacrifices; but rather, this performance testifies to the sincerity of the repentance of those whose only hope is in direct access to God through repentance, who have nothing to hope from sacrifices because of their great sins. Thus Amos 5 : 22-24, without discussing ver. 25, the meaning of which is much disputed, evidently means, in the context, especially in relation to ver. 16-20, that we have here sacrifices unacceptable on account of sin which puts the of-

ferers outside of their scope. They also emphasize the need of a changed life as an expression of repentance in the words (ver. 24), "But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." This side is more fully stated in ver. 14f, preceding, "Seek good, and not evil, that ye may live; and so Jehovah, the God of hosts, will be with you, as ye say. Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish justice in the gate: it may be that Jehovah, the God of hosts, will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph." The same thought is found in Hosea 6 : 6, which should be rendered, "For love I delight in, and not sacrifice; and knowledge of God, and not burnt offerings." Here the relation to the covenant is emphasized by the next verse, which speaks of those concerned as transgressing the covenant. Such is also clearly the thought of Isa. 1 : 11-17. The condition of those addressed is evident from the preceding part of the chapter, and is also shown by the reason given in ver. 15 for the unacceptableness of the worship, "your hands are full of blood." Here the way to God's favor is clearly shown by ver. 16f, "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well;

seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow," as well as by the following ver. 18-20. The thought is the same in Micah 6 : 6-8. The condition of the people addressed is shown by other parts of the prophecy, as chap. 3. Here the demand upon the wicked nation is " to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God." This is clearly the thought also of Ps. 51 : 16, 17. This is written by one who has committed great transgression, therefore sacrifice is of no avail for his sin. The only way to approach God is through repentance (ver. 17), " The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."

A few other passages are based upon the same general ideas, but go a little farther. Prov. 21 : 3 states, " To do righteousness and justice is more acceptable to Jehovah than sacrifice." It seems probable that this should be rendered, " To do righteousness and justice is acceptable to Jehovah rather than sacrifice." Here there is no context that enables one to say whether it is distinctly sacrifice of the wicked that is in mind. Yet the passages already cited would make that a natural thought, at least for the starting-point. Of course

those who do not righteousness and justice are sinners from whom sacrifice would not be acceptable, but who often had an exaggerated conception of the efficacy of sacrifice. This, then, would be of the nature of a generalization from the teachings already mentioned: sacrifices cannot, as it is often thought, take the place of righteousness and justice. The same is probably to be regarded as the teaching of Ps. 40 : 6-8. Here the thought is that sacrifice cannot take the place of obedience. This regards "sin offering" as the proper rendering in the last clause of ver. 6. With the view of Briggs [1] and a few others, that this should be rendered "sin," we should have simply the general teaching that sacrifice from a great sinner is unacceptable.

In Ps. 50 : 8-14, a somewhat different thought seems to be found. There sacrifices are not entirely rejected, in fact they are recognized in ver. 5, "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Here, then, it is not the wicked but the righteous that are addressed. What is reproved in this passage is apparently an excessive valuation of the sacrifice as a *gift* to God. In ver. 16-21, when

[1] Commentary *in loco.*

the wicked are addressed, who have broken the covenant, there is no mention of sacrifice.

There are many other passages which speak of direct approach to God, often with mercy and forgiveness, without mention of sacrifice. In many of these, at any rate, those are thought of who have committed great sin, and who consequently could obtain nothing from sacrifice. This is especially the case in the prophets, where it is particularly the national salvation that is in mind, based upon God's direct forgiveness, although individuals are also included. God's direct forgiveness is thus spoken of, *e. g.*, in Isa. 38 : 17; Micah 7 : 19; Isa. 44 : 22. It is clear, also, that for the most part in the psalms it is those who have committed great sin who are thought of when God's forgiveness is mentioned, as in 78 : 38; 79 : 9; 85 : 2. This is not equally evident in Ps. 65 : 3, but the terms used would naturally suggest it.

There are also a few passages which speak of approach to God in the temple, or tabernacle, where sacrifice might naturally be mentioned, but it is ignored. These are especially Ps. 24 : 3-6, and Isa. 33 : 14-16, although in the latter there is no direct reference to the temple, but to the pres-

ence of God. Here the qualifications for entrance to Yahweh are ethical, not ritual. In these there seems to be a disposition to ignore the sacrifices in their own sphere, substituting ethical character for them. Probably, however, they should be regarded simply as illustrations of the tendency, already mentioned, to place the *emphasis* upon character rather than sacrifices.

Ps. 26:6 apparently demands an ethical preparation for joining in the worship at the altar; if so, it seems to be the only passage directly making this demand. Probably a better rendering for the verse, however, is, "I have washed my hands in innocency; then may I compass thine altar, O Jehovah." With this rendering the meaning is, as suggested by indications in the psalm, that the author was debarred, apparently by dangerous sickness, from the temple. He is praying for restoration to health, and at the same time for relief from the suspicion that he is a great sinner, which might be indicated by his affliction. With this interpretation the verse is simply based on the fundamental idea of the limitation of the scope of sacrifice.

The passages quoted, and others, which speak of approach to God without sacrifice, often use for

atonement the word כִּפֶּר, the word that is used in the ritual literature. In its usual and characteristic non-ritual use, the word has God for the subject and sin as the object. It seems reasonably clear that the ritual use of the word is the older, both because it more clearly expresses the original force of the root, and also because that gives a more natural development of the meaning than the reverse process would afford. In harmony with the broadening of the early ritual meaning of sin, this ritual term has naturally come to be used with a wider application. This word, originally signifying to wash away, as a physical, ceremonial act, should here probably be understood to mean, as a spiritual act, the *complete removal* of sin, which is suggested also by many other Old Testament words and phrases. In this removal there is no instrumentality, in general, aside from God himself; he removes sin by reason of his very nature, his mercy, his forgiving love, especially "for his name's sake." Of course a repentant spirit on the part of man is a general condition for this. Sin in its real force and power is thus not atoned for by sacrifice, but is forgiven by God himself. This conception marks the great difference between the Old Testament

and the other Semitic religions in reference to salvation. The conception of sacrifice within its sphere is the same, except in details, as that prevailing elsewhere. It is the conception of the limitation of the scope of sacrifice, and of salvation apart from it, that is really unique in the Old Testament.

PART IV

THE FUTURE LIFE

I

THE GENERAL CONCEPTION

THE subject of this part is the future life, rather than a more general subject like *the last things*. The reason is that certain things in the Old Testament doctrine which would be included under the more general title have practically no equivalent elsewhere. This is especially true of the Messianic teaching of the Old Testament and the related ideas concerning the future of the kingdom of God. There is nothing sufficiently parallel to this among the other nations under consideration to need any detailed consideration. It is true that there are slight resemblances between this Messianic expectation and the Egyptian anticipation of a future king who should be a deliverer.[1] The resemblance to the work of Marduk in Babylonia[2] is much slighter. But any such parallels yet known do

[1] Jeremias, "*Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*," 2d ed., p. 406f.
[2] Jeremias, "*Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*," 2d ed., p. 180.

not touch the real essence of the Old Testament Messianic expectation.

The only Semitic religion, aside from the Old Testament, in which any extended teaching concerning the future life has been found is the Babylonian. For purposes of comparison it may be desirable to state first the Babylonian conception, after which the Egyptian view, as well as other fragmentary Semitic teachings, will be briefly mentioned. The Babylonian conception of the earth is as a mountain. The origin of this conception is uncertain, but that does not particularly affect the present matter. The abode of the dead was conceived of as a cave under a mountain. This might seem to point to a time when the people lived in a mountainous district and buried in caves.[1] But that is by no means certain. Doubtless it does indicate that in early times, as well as later, the dead were buried in the earth. The idea of a cave may have been a natural development of the idea of the grave, as necessary in order to any freedom of movement. Many features in the conception of the abode of the dead come from the grave. The name of the underworld in Babylonian is *Aralu*. Some have thought

[1] Jastrow, "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 557.

that there is another name occurring a few times, *Shualu,* the Hebrew שְׁאוֹל, *Sheol,* but this is very doubtful. This region is represented as a dark and gloomy place, surrounded by seven walls. It was thus strongly guarded so that none of the dead could escape and none of the living could enter. It was presided over by the goddess Allatu and her consort Nergal, accompanied by associated gods and demons. In the poem called "Ishtar's Descent to Hades," containing an account of a visit of the goddess Ishtar to the underworld, is given a good description of this region.

Toward the land of No-Return, the region of darkness,
Ishtar, the daughter of the Moon-god, directed her attention.
The Moon-god's daughter directed her attention
Toward the house of darkness, Irkalla's dwelling-place,
Toward the house out of which he who enters never comes,
Toward the road whose way turns not back,
Toward the house where he who enters is deprived of light,
A place where dust is their sustenance, their food clay,
Light they see not, they sit in darkness,
They are clothed, like a bird, with feathered raiment,
Over door and bolt is spread the dust.[1]

Jastrow describes the condition of the dead, on the Babylonian view, as follows:[2] "What dis-

[1] ABL, p. 408. [2] "Religion of Babylonia and Assyria," p. 276f.

tinguishes the dead from the living is their inactivity. They lie in Aralu without doing anything. Everything there is in a state of neglect and decay. The dead can speak, but the Babylonians probably believed, like the Hebrews, that the dead talk in whispers, or chirp like birds. The dead are weak, and, therefore, unless others attend to their needs, they suffer pangs of hunger, or must content themselves with 'dust and clay' as their food. Tender care during the last moments of life was essential to comparative well-being in Aralu. The person who goes to Aralu in sorrow and neglect will continue sorrowful and neglected." The condition of the dead was thus a shadowy kind of existence. Aralu was under the control of the gods and goddesses already mentioned; the other gods had nothing to do with it; it was beyond their province.

A similar conception at a late date among the Phœnicians is indicated by allusions in the inscriptions of Eshmunazar and Tabnith of Sidon, about 300 B. C. Each of these pronounces a curse on any one who disturbs his grave, wishing, among other things, that he may have no "resting-place among the shades," משכב את רפאם.[1]

[1] CIS, I, 3; Cooke, "A Text-book of North-Semitic Inscriptions," pp. 26f, 30f.

The Aramaic inscription of Panammu, eighth century B. C., implies a future life in speaking of himself after death as eating and drinking with the god Hadad.[1]

The Egyptian religion contains many inconsistent representations concerning the future life, as on many other points. The principal teachings are those of the cults of Ra and Osiris. In the doctrine of Ra, the abode of the dead was under the earth, and was a cheerless region, as in the Babylonian conception, being ordinarily in darkness. It was a region in its characteristics much like Egypt itself. In the doctrine of Osiris, the abode was more cheerful, but the general conditions of existence are not clearly stated.

There can hardly be any question that the general conception of the Hebrew Sheol has no distinctively Egyptian features, and is the same as the Babylonian idea of Aralu. This is a conception which is assumed as familiar in the Old Testament, and more frequently alluded to than directly taught. A few passages will show the principal features of the Old Testament view. In Job 10 : 21f, Job says, " Before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and of

[1] Cooke, " A Text-book of North-Semitic Inscriptions," p. 160 seq.

the shadow of death; the land dark as midnight; the land of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as midnight." In Eccl. 9 : 5f, 10, it is said, "For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. As well their love, as their hatred and their envy, is perished long ago; neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun. . . Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in Sheol, whither thou goest." That there is no return is also emphasized in Job 7 : 9f; 16 : 22; 2 Sam. 12 : 23. The only material modification of the view that appears in the Old Testament, aside from the matter of the distinction between the righteous and wicked, which will be treated later, is concerning the relation of Yahweh to Sheol. There is no express statement in the Old Testament that Yahweh has no power over Sheol. There is clearly the idea that the dead have nothing to do with him, which, however, evidently approaches the matter from the other side, from the standpoint of the dead, in their loss of the relations

that prevail in this life. Thus it is said (Ps. 115 : 17), "The dead praise not Jehovah, neither any that go down into silence," and Ps. 6 : 5, "For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in Sheol who shall give thee thanks?" The general teaching of the Old Testament, even in early times, is that Yahweh, as a god of supreme and universal power, cannot be limited to this life, but his control extends even to Sheol. Thus in the song of Hannah it is said (1 Sam. 2 : 6), "Jehovah killeth, and maketh alive: he bringeth down to Sheol, and bringeth up." Ps. 139 : 8 says, "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou are there."

The spirits of the dead, it was thought by the Babylonians, could return to earth and cause sickness of men. In this work they were like the evil demons, and were called by the same names, chiefly *ekimmu,* sometimes *utukku,* which were two among several names of the demons. Incantations were directed against them, as against the demons. There were also priests who had to do especially with the spirits of the dead, these were known as *sha ekimmu.* These could bring up the dead (*mushelu ekimmu*). The spirit thus

brought up is known as *shulu.*[1] There are ceremonies for exorcising these spirits of the dead who have taken possession of a man.[2] Offerings are made to them for their food, called *kispu,* and libations, called *naq me, pouring out of water.*[3] They are also given other gifts, such as clothing. These offerings, it would seem, are largely to pacify the spirits so as to prevent trouble from them, or to drive them away from one whom they have attacked. Partly also, it would seem, this was prompted by real solicitude for the welfare of ancestors, who are, of course, the spirits ordinarily in mind.[4]

The only Old Testament account of the return of a spirit of the dead is in the real or supposed bringing up of Samuel (1 Sam. 28 : 8-19), where the phraseology has resemblances to the Babylonian terms, especially in the use of *bring up* (הֶעֱלָה), corresponding to the Babylonian *mushelu.* But in connection with this passage and elsewhere, the Old Testament regularly forbids such practices. The other Babylonian features mentioned are unknown in the Old Testament, or specifically forbidden.

[1] See especially KAT, 3d ed., pp. 460, 640.
[2] See especially Zimmern, "Ritual Tablets," No. 52, pp. 164-167.
[3] Zimmern, "Ritual Tablets," No. 52, pp. 164-167.
[4] See KB, II, pp. 262f, 192f.

II

REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS IN THE FUTURE LIFE

BEFORE directly considering the subject before us, it may be well to state again briefly the conception concerning rewards and punishments in this life found in the Old Testament and among the Babylonians and Assyrians. The general teaching in both is substantially the same. They teach that righteousness is rewarded and sin punished in this life. Of course the meaning of this depends upon the meaning of the terms, which varies somewhat in the two cases, as has already been seen. According to the Babylonian conception, sin is only definitely known by its results—in disaster. Hence there is nothing to interfere with the teaching that sin brings punishment, because the sin, of some kind, may be definitely concluded from the disaster itself. The conception of righteousness as bringing reward, however, was apparently rather a negative one; the reward was, in general, the absence

of sickness or disaster. It was a part of the conception that sin brought death, and hence that long life was a reward of righteousness. This appears prominently in the formula that is common in the letters and elsewhere, wishing for one length of days.

In the Old Testament the conception of sin was more clearly defined, as has been seen, and on a higher basis. The result was that disaster without special sin was observed, as well as prosperity of the wicked, and such cases proved confusing. Hence, while the general conception is like the Babylonian, as has been stated, in the later Old Testament teaching this was considered to have exceptions, although not fully abandoned. That long life was the result of righteousness was a part of the general Old Testament view.

Since the general conception in both nations thus contemplated rewards and punishments with a measure of fulness in this life, it is not surprising that we find comparatively little concerning them in relation to the future life. In considering whether there is any relation of the kind, it will be convenient to begin with the Babylonian belief. The questions here are two, which will be considered somewhat together. First, are there any

differences in the condition of separate individuals in Aralu? Secondly, if there are such differences in condition, are they due to the life in the present world, in such a way that they can be considered rewards or punishments?

The clearest passage for difference in condition of souls in the underworld is found in the Gilgamesh narrative, tablet XII, col. VI, ll. 1-12. The preceding context is broken away, so that the reference of the first line is doubtful. The translation is as follows:[1]

Rests on a soft couch, and drinks pure water;
The hero slain in battle—
Thou and I have often seen such an one—
His father and mother support his head,
And his wife [kneels] at his side.
Yea! the spirit of such a man is at rest.
But the man whose corpse remains [unburied] upon the field—
Thou and I have often seen such an one—
His spirit does not find rest in the earth (*i. e.*, Hades).
The man whose spirit has no one who cares for it—
Thou and I have often seen such an one—
Consumes the dregs of the bowl, the broken remnants of food,
That are cast into the street.

In the first line the rendering "soft couch" might convey a wrong impression, the rendering

[1] ABL, p. 366.

"couch" would probably be better. It is the usual word for couch, *ma'alu*. The word "rests" (*salil*) is the same word as is used below, with a negative, in the description of the one whose body is unburied. It is not certain that the first line refers to the hero slain in battle. But assuming, as is usually done, that that is the case, his condition is not the result of his being a hero, but of the care he receives from relatives. The one who has not rest, but must wander about, is the one whose body is unburied. The first line, then, in this statement probably only means that the one who receives proper care, especially burial, has rest in the underworld. Such a one, who has proper care, also has pure water to drink; while the one who has no care has nothing fit to eat or drink. This care includes care at the time of death, and evidently also after death, as is here seen especially from the statement, "The man whose spirit has no one who cares for it." This care doubtless included the food and drink offered to the spirits of the dead, already mentioned. It seems evident that the conception is that the food and drink offered to the dead form their food and drink; if this is not provided, they have only fragments to eat and that which is left by

others to drink. The inscription on the conical piece of clay placed in coffins invokes this blessing on any one who leaves it undisturbed, "May his name be blessed in the Upperworld, and in the Underworld may his departed spirit drink of clear water." [1] Here it is evident that there is no statement of the definite way to reach this desirable end. In the light of what has already been noted this is only a wish that the one who has shown kindness to the dead may receive it from others.

In tablet X, col. VI of the Gilgamesh narrative, it is said of the Anunnaki, the great gods, and the goddess of fate that they determine death and life. This is said in connection with the underworld, but the precise reference is not altogether clear. It is thought by some that it refers to the determination of the fate of those who arrive there. But it seems much more natural to regard it as referring to those on this earth, for it is immediately followed by the statement, "the day of death is unknown." Hence this would have no reference to the question before us.

The conclusion, then, is that the Babylonians

[1] Delitzsch, "Babel and Bible," p. 49; see also KAT, 3d ed., p. 638.

knew nothing of a separation in space between different classes in the underworld. In general, all shared the same conditions. A spirit whose body was unburied, however, was obliged to wander without finding rest. The care of relatives and friends, especially the offerings, provided food and drink for the spirits; and those who had not such care consequently suffered. This difference in condition, however, had no reference to moral condition or to the life on earth; it was not, therefore, in any real sense reward or punishment.

The Phœnician passages already quoted show a belief, similar to the Babylonian, that some of the shades had a resting-place in the next world. In the Aramaic inscription of Panammu, already referred to, a teaching of future blessedness seems to be found. But it is doubtful whether this indicates a general belief of that kind: it may rather show a hope of some special treatment, perhaps deification, of himself as a king.

In both phases of the Egyptian doctrine already referred to there is some distinction between the righteous and the wicked. In the cult of Ra, this distinction was made on ritual and magical grounds. The abode of the righteous

was by a river, the counterpart of the Nile. This was, however, a world of darkness, the region of night, lighted each night for a brief space by Ra, the sun god, as he passed through it in his bark. The ordinary lot of the righteous had little that was attractive: it was vague and shadowy. A few of the righteous were received into the bark with Ra and made the journey with him in perpetual light: they were absorbed into him. But this distinction was not the reward of a good life, it was the lot of a few of the rich and learned who were acquainted with certain mystic formulæ. The wicked were also located on the banks of a river and subjected to tortures from horrible monsters, such as strange animals and fiery serpents.

This cult of Ra was particularly the official religion. The Osiris cult, however, placed more emphasis on the future life. The teaching on this point is contained in portions of the Book of the Dead. In this, also, the separation between the righteous and wicked is largely on magical and ritual grounds, although ethical features are also included. In the early part of the journey after death the spirit must repeat certain prayers and incantations in order to escape the enemies lying

in wait—demons in various animal forms—and arrive in safety at the judgment hall, where he was received by Mat, the goddess of truth and law. Here Osiris on the judgment seat waited to pronounce sentence on the soul. The soul repeated a prescribed confession, containing both ritual and ethical elements. Then the *heart,* or conscience, of the man was weighed, to see whether his statements were borne out by his life. If so, he was admitted to the fields of Alu, the abode of the blest. Concerning the condition there the description is vague. These righteous were obliged to do some manual labor, although their places might be taken by *ushebtis,* figures buried with the mummies. The ultimate condition seems to have been absorption into Osiris. The conditions of life for the wicked were even more uncertian; Sayce thinks their ultimate fate was annihilation.[1] The final condition of the righteous seems to be the same on both views, a pantheistic absorption.

In this matter of separation between righteous and wicked, the Old Testament shows no marked resemblance to the Egyptian doctrines.

The general conception of Sheol, as has been

[1] "The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia," p. 179.

said, is like the Babylonian Aralu, and is found throughout the Old Testament. Yet the Old Testament does make a distinct advance upon this thought. This appears in two ways. So far as concerns the actual condition in Sheol, the Old Testament does not definitely divide between the righteous and the wicked. But in the later time, as the conception of retribution in this world allows many exceptions, the problem of evil is felt to call for a solution, and in the absence of a satisfactory solution in this life the thought turns to the future life. There are a few passages, therefore, in which the expectation is expressed that the righteous may not be given over to the power of Sheol, and this is based upon their fellowship with Yahweh. This is seen especially in Ps. 16; 49; 73; Job 19 : 25-27. But these passages give no definite teaching. Prov. 11 : 7 and 14 : 32 give expression to the same hope. The other addition to the idea of Sheol is by the teaching of a resurrection. This appears in the prophetic thought at first as a national resurrection, the nation which has died in exile shall be raised again from the dead, as in Ezek. 37. Then this idea of national resurrection is extended to the individual, so that the teaching of the resurrec-

tion of the righteous dead appears in some passages; see especially Isa. 26 : 19. This is further extended to the wicked as well, with a separation between them, in Dan. 12 : 2, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." This marked contrast appears between the Old Testament teaching and that of the other religions, the distinction between righteous and wicked is one that is based on ethical grounds.

PART V

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

IT will be necessary to summarize some of the results already reached, and then in the light of these summaries to discuss certain general conclusions.

The first thing to note is that much has been found which is common to the Old Testament teaching and to one or more of the other Semitic religions. The one prominent feature in which the Old Testament teaching is the same as the teaching of these other religions generally is in reference to sacrifice. The sacrificial system of the Old Testament is substantially identical with the common-Semitic sacrificial system. It differs from that in details, as the other religions also differ among themselves in a similar way. But in reference to the kinds of sacrifice and their significance it is in substantial accord with common-Semitic ideas, as also in general in reference to salvation through sacrifice. The great difference, however, is in the limitation of

the scope of sacrifice. In reference to sin, also, a portion of the Old Testament teaching has a marked similarity to the common-Semitic ideas. But this is not the highest point in the Old Testament development of the thought; that point is a teaching concerning sin that is radically superior to the common-Semitic teaching. Again, the teaching concerning the future life in the most of the Old Testament is in substantial accord with the Babylonian views. But the introduction in the Old Testament of the teaching concerning rewards and punishments, together with the resurrection, marks a higher stage, although this appears late in the Old Testament, and in only a few passages. These three teachings, concerning sacrifice, sin, and the future life, are those in which the greatest resemblance is to be seen between the Old Testament and the other religions. There is a close resemblance, to be sure, in the views of the personality of the divine nature, which resemblance is of a different kind, however, since that is a feature which almost necessarily results from anthropomorphism, and hence has comparatively little significance.

At the other end of the scale stand those Old Testament teachings in which the contrast with

the common-Semitic view is especially marked. Here is to be noted first the teaching concerning divine unity, in which the Old Testament differs radically from the common-Semitic view, even although tendencies in the direction of monotheism are to be noted in the other religions. The teaching concerning divine spirituality is also in marked contrast with the common-Semitic view, although traces of spirituality are to be noted elsewhere. So also the teaching concerning the ethical completeness of Yahweh is without a parallel in the common-Semitic view, the latter contemplating the deities for the most part as non-moral, and sometimes immoral, with traces of ethical elements. The conception of salvation apart from sacrifice or incantation, as presented in the Old Testament, also, has no real parallel to the teaching in the other religions, and is in marked contrast with their teachings. The Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament, further, which was alluded to, is without any close known parallel among the other nations considered.

The other specific points on which comparison has been made are intermediate between these two extremes. They show resemblances and dif-

ferences; but the differences are greater than the resemblances. Here are to be included all the divine metaphysical attributes, eternity, omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience; and also the moral attributes, faithfulness, righteousness, and love. In all these the Old Testament teaching is in marked contrast with the common-Semitic view; but there are somewhat stronger tendencies elsewhere in the direction of the Old Testament teachings than in the case of the group previously mentioned. In both groups, the Old Testament teaching is not only different from, but clearly superior to, that of the other religions.

The comparison made with the Egyptian religion has been slight, but no close resemblances to the Old Testament have been observed.

In passing from the summary to the conclusions, the first question to be discussed is concerning the origin of this element which is common to the Old Testament and one or more of the other Semitic religions. Here should be considered first the group in which the resemblance is greatest. There are three theoretical possibilities to account for such similarities: (1) independent development, with no connection; (2) borrowing, in one direction or another; (3) inheritance from

common ancestors. The first is manifestly improbable where the resemblance is marked. In the case of the group of marked resemblances, we note concerning two points, sin and sacrifice, that the common element belongs to the formal, and hence to the lower, side of the teaching; and that in both the common element was evidently held by the Hebrews at a comparatively early stage in the national development, as well as later. This statement is based directly upon the occurrence of these ideas at an early period, and also upon the fact that the higher view of both subjects, which is manifestly a later development, is itself rather early. The teaching on both points, consequently, is too early to be naturally borrowed from the Babylonians, from whom borrowing is usually supposed to have taken place, if at all. Borrowing from the Babylonians may most naturally be supposed to have taken place at the time of the Babylonian captivity, less naturally at the time of the Assyrian invasions. At any other time borrowing from the Babylonians or Assyrians would be indirect rather than direct. Against any large amount of borrowing is also the fact that comparatively few words for similar ideas are the same in the Babylonian and Hebrew

languages. The teaching concerning the future life, further, is closely connected with these other teachings, and is clearly found at an early point in the Hebrew development. Hence in this group where the resemblance is closest the common element, it would seem, must be accounted for as the result of inheritance from common ancestors: these views are the expression of ideas which, if they may not be called primitive Semitic ideas, at any rate approach the primitive. It is not meant that there may not also be some borrowing, but this, if so, must pertain to the details rather than to the main substance of the conceptions.

Here, doubtless, reference should be made to the view that the Hebrew sacrificial system was largely borrowed from the Canaanites. This is a frequent assumption, but positive evidence for it seems to be lacking. It is based principally upon the idea that the religion of Israel before the conquest of Canaan, sometimes called the nomad religion, was simple, and sacrifice was an unimportant element in it. After the conquest, in the so-called peasant religion, it was an elaborate system, with a fully developed sacrificial system. The Canaanites also, it is said, had a fully developed sacrificial and ceremonial system.

Therefore this system, it is thought, must have been borrowed from the Canaanites. "There can be no doubt about it, the sacrificial cultus is in its main features a Canaanite institution appropriated by Israel after the conquest." [1] This view exaggerates the contrast between the condition before and after the conquest. There is no reason to suppose that there was ever a time in the early history of Israel when sacrifice was considered unimportant. This view of the religion before the conquest is based chiefly upon Amos 5 : 25 and Jer. 7 : 22, the interpretation of both of which is doubtful, and probably does not support these contentions. That there was some change after the conquest is unquestionably the case, but there is no evidence to show that it was in essence more than a fuller unfolding and development of the institutions already in existence. That there was probably influence by the Canaanites, and borrowing from them, is not denied; it is only maintained that there is no evidence that this affected more than the *details* of the cultus. In fact, the recent evidence of excavations in Palestine goes to show that the attitude of the

[1] Marti, "The Religion of the Old Testament," p. 88; see also p. 66 seq.

Hebrews toward the Canaanite religion was largely one of opposition, and that not only at a later time but soon after the conquest. This is indicated especially by the fact that human sacrifice (child sacrifice) is shown by these excavations to have been very common among the Canaanites; while among the Hebrews it was very rare. In fact, no traces of it during the Hebrew period were found at Taanek, while at Gezer those found were only in the form of offerings in connection with buildings. *"Dagegen ist schon jetzt fast mit Bestimmheit zu behaupten, dass die Spuren von Kinderopfern nach 1200* [B. C.] *ganz selten werden, fast nur doch in der Form von Bauopfern nachzuweisen sind."* [1]

The larger number of Old Testament ideas come in the group where the resemblance with the other Semitic religions is much less than in the cases already cited. Here it is not possible to speak very definitely; but there is no reason to reach a different conclusion from the preceding. In cases where this resemblance is close, the cause is naturally early Semitic inheritance. In details, it is quite possible that there has been influence or borrowing. It is also possible that

[1] Sellin, *"Der Ertrag der Ausgrabungen im Orient,"* p. 34.

there may have been some independent development: starting with certain ideas common to the Semitic mind, the different nations may have moved along similar lines independently of each other.

We come to a further consideration of the *distinctive* teachings of the Old Testament, those which are peculiar to the Old Testament, without close parallel among the other Semitic religions. Here it will be advisable to consider first the group of most strongly marked individuality, in which are included the teachings which are in decided contrast with the other religions. At this point it is of course desirable to keep in mind the limitations of our knowledge, *i. e.,* of the material available for comparison. Yet that consideration does not justify such sweeping statements as those of Winckler, that all doctrines of the Hebrews were derived from the Babylonians: those not found in their literature will yet be found.[1] It is a significant fact that the closest resemblances of the Old Testament teachings to the Babylonian, and to those of the other Semitic religions as well, are in reference to the lower parts of the Old Testament, those which deal

[1] "The History of Babylonia and Assyria," especially p. 157f.

chiefly with the formal side; while the distinctive teachings in the Old Testament are those which pertain to the highest part of the Old Testament, the most spiritual and ethical side. It is these *highest* teachings of the Old Testament which are most clearly without parallel in the other Semitic religions. This group of specially distinctive teachings, it will be remembered, included the unity of God (monotheism), his spirituality, his ethical completeness, and the salvation of man through direct approach to him. Here the unity of God is the *condition* of any exalted conception of his character; his spirituality and ethical completeness pertain to the highest features of any possible conception of his character; while the salvation of man through direct access to him is a salvation in harmony with that exalted character, more fully in harmony than any formal way of salvation, not to say any magical way, could possibly be. These things are not only a part of the highest teachings of the Old Testament, but they pertain to the most fundamental portions of it.

We have discussed the source of the *common* elements in the Old Testament. What shall be said concerning the source of the *distinctive* ele-

ments? These, we have seen, are not only different from the conceptions of the other Semitic religions, they are far superior to them. And yet the Hebrews were not superior in other ways to all the other Semitic nations. The Babylonians, at any rate, were undoubtedly their superiors in education, in civilization, and in material prosperity. Neither did the Hebrews possess a taste for religious thought that was peculiar. There is no evidence that they possessed this in general to any higher degree than the other Semitic nations; all were religious, in action and in thought. There seems, then, to be no *human* cause for the result that is clearly evident. What could be expected from human nature at those times and under those circumstances is shown by the religions of the other Semitic nations. The marked superiority of the Old Testament teachings in reference to that which is most fundamental indicates clearly, then, that here a new cause is in operation. That cause, it seems evident, is the unique presence of God, the illumination of God giving perception of spiritual truth, that which is usually called, and fitly, the special revelation of God.

This conclusion is confirmed, and not at all contradicted, by the many teachings in which the

Old Testament is much different from the teachings of the other Semitic religions, but in which the difference is somewhat less marked than in these cases just cited. In all these the difference is in favor of the Old Testament; the teachings there are superior to the teachings of these other religions.

From what has already been said, however, the question naturally arises, Why is there in the Old Testament such a combination of the higher and the lower, of that which has come directly from the revelation of God and that which has come, at least directly, through men, through inheritance from Semitic ancestors? This question may be considered from various standpoints. It is often considered from the standpoint of God: in giving his will by revelation, why did he mingle the spiritual knowledge of himself with that which is lower, the formal? This is a question, of course, which it is difficult to answer fully; no one is able to speak adequately for God on such a question as this, and to state all the reasons which may have entered in. But a study of God's dealings with men elsewhere, as well as among the Hebrews, and some knowledge of human nature justify the inference that, at any

rate, one prominent reason for such a course was the educational principle that men must be taught gradually, that the new truth must be brought into relation with the old belief, that the new must have points of contact with the old. If those to whom the revelation came were to receive it intelligently, and there is no reason to think otherwise, this general principle would apply, as in other relations. For the more detailed working out of this principle it is better to turn from what God must have done, in harmony with his nature and the nature of man, and see what he did, to observe how in reality this principle works itself out in the Old Testament, to see how the new truth actually comes into relation with the old view in the experience of men. Here we need to notice several different things, in their application to the matter before us.

We observe that the revelation of God's truth to an individual writer or speaker of the Old Testament was not a full-orbed sphere of truth: a single truth or a few great truths constitute the individual message. There were manifold limitations in the knowledge of truth by the individual. It was distinctly a revelation of religious truth, not historical or scientific. And within the re-

ligious realm the content of the individual contribution was small, comprising at the most in each case but a few important conceptions of the character of God and man's relation to him. This is easily seen in the case of the great prophets, whose individual messages were limited in scope. This may fairly be considered the universal rule, the revelation of God to the individual writer or speaker of the Old Testament consisted in a few things unfolded to him. Such was the message, and the work of putting this in form for popular presentation, and of adjusting it in its relation to other truth and to views commonly held by the people was a task in which the human powers came into prominent use; there was co-operation of the divine and the human. This work of adjustment was not only in relation to the views of others, but to his own as well. This meant that the consequences of the truth he proclaimed were only partially grasped by the inspired writer or speaker, and that often it required a long time to work out the full consequences of certain truth proclaimed: in some cases this was not perfectly done, or even approximately so, in Old Testament times. Yet continually the progress of revelation in the Old

Testament resulted not only in the proclamation of new phases of truth, but also in the further adjustment of truth already proclaimed to the views that had preceded it.

We have already noted that the distinctive teaching of the Old Testament centers about God, revealing the truth that he is one, infinite, spiritual, ethical, and revealing that man's relation to God is in harmony with this, that sin is ethical, and man's relation to God is on an ethical basis, not a ritual. The older, common-Semitic, idea was that the gods were physical, that sin was ritual, and that forgiveness was through the instrumentality of sacrifice or magic. Some departure from these ideas had taken place before the beginning of the distinctive Hebrew thought, but it was not a fundamental departure. The Hebrew conception began with a higher view of God, that he is one, spiritual, and ethical. This displaced entirely, so far as definite statement is concerned, the view that there were many gods, and that they were physical, material. Some of the applications of this truth to the relation of man to God were also quickly seen. There was speedy condemnation of immoral acts in the service of Yahweh, such as unchastity, and also of

everything magical: these things were seen to be utterly opposed to the exalted ideas of God which had been revealed. So also, in general, everything that is clearly of a superstitious nature is forbidden. But the attitude toward that which was formal, the ritual, sacrifices, ritual sin, regulations concerning ceremonial uncleanness, etc., was quite different. These were retained through the whole Old Testament period. These originally were based upon an idea of God as physical, yet in their development the original idea had been considerably modified, so that that idea was less obviously and necessarily inherent than in the practices forbidden. Evidently they were never felt, in Old Testament times, to be clearly inconsistent with the exalted conception of God that was held. At the same time it is obvious that here is a ceremonial conception of God which is lower than the spiritual and ethical teaching found elsewhere. These elements, however, are incorporated with the higher idea of God, and never eliminated. But practically their scope was greatly limited, so that they had to do with the national relations, with the religion as a State religion, while in the individual life they had less importance. Historically, also, it is obvious that to the thought of

the mass of the people this formal side of the religion was the one for which they had special appreciation. And this side had its uses, as well as its injurious effects, in giving to the mass of the people who had no appreciation for anything higher an expression for their religious aspirarations. It could hardly be expected that this side could have been done away, in Old Testament times, unless there had been a much fuller appreciation by the people of the spiritual nature of religion. Even in the progress of God's revelation, it is only gradually that the higher view triumphs over the lower, that the imperfect gives way to the adequate expression of truth.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

RELIGIOUS TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

GENERAL

Cooke, G. A. A Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions, Moabite, Hebrew, Phœnician, Aramaic, Nabatæan, Palmyrene, Jewish. Oxford, 1903.

Corpus Inscriptionum semiticarum, ab Academia Inscriptionum et Litterarum Humaniorum conditum atque digestum. Paris. Pars Prima. Inscriptiones Phœnicias Continens. Tomus I (4 parts), 1881, 1883, 1885, 1887. Tomus II (2 parts), 1890, 1899. Pars Secunda, Inscriptiones Aramaicas Continens. Tomus I (3 parts), 1889, 1893, 1902. Pars Quarta, Inscriptiones Himyariticas et Sabæas Continens. Tomus I (3 parts), 1889, 1892, 1900. Cited as CIS.

Lidzbarski, M. Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik, nebst ausgewählten Inschriften. I and II. Weimar, 1898.

ASSYRIAN AND BABYLONIAN

Banks, E. J. Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen der von George Reisner herausgegeben Sammlung, umschrieben, übersetzt und erklärt. Breslau, 1897.

Behrens, E. Assyrisch-Babylonische Briefe kultischen Inhalts aus der Sargonidenzeit. Leipzig, 1906.

Craig, Jas. A. Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts. I and II. Leipzig, 1895-1897.

Dhorme, Paul. Choix de Textes Religieux Assyro-Babyloniens. Paris, 1907.

Gray, C. D. The Shamash Religious Texts. Chicago, 1901.

Harper, R. F., and others. Assyrian and Babylonian Literature. New York, 1901. Cited as ABL.

Haupt, Paul. Akkadische und Sumerische Keilschrifttexte. Leipzig, 1881-1882.

Hrozný, Fr. Sumerisch-Babylonische Mythen von dem Gotte Ninrag (Ninib). Berlin, 1903.

Hussey, Mary I. Some Sumerian-Babylonian Hymns of the Berlin Collection, transcribed and interpreted, with collation of the original tablets, from the text published by George Reisner. Chicago, 1907.

Jensen, P. Assyrisch-Babylonische Mythen und Epen. Berlin, 1900. (Vol. VI, 1, in Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek.) Cited as KB.

King, L. W. Babylonian Magic and Sorcery, being "The Prayers of the Lifting of the Hand." London, 1896.

Knudtzon, J. A. Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott für Staat und königliches Haus aus der Zeit Asarhaddons und Assurbanipals. I and II. Leipzig, 1893.

Macmillan, K. D. Some Cuneiform Tablets bearing on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Leipzig, 1906.

Rawlinson, H. C. A Selection from the Miscellaneous Inscriptions of Assyria. Second edition. London, 1891. (The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, IV.)

Reisner, George. Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen nach Thontafeln Griechischer Zeit. Berlin, 1896.

Tallqvist, K. L. Die Assyrische Beschwörungsserie Maqlû. Leipzig, 1894.

Zimmern, Heinrich. Babylonische Busspsalmen, umschrieben, übersetzt und erklärt. Leipzig, 1885.

Zimmern, Heinrich. Babylonische Hymnen und Gebete in Auswahl. Leipzig, 1905.

Zimmern, Heinrich. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion. Leipzig, 1901.

GENERAL WORKS ON SEMITIC RELIGION

Barton, G. A. A Sketch of Semitic Origins, social and religious. New York, 1902.

Baudissin, W. W. F. Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte. I and II. Leipzig, 1876-1878.

Curtiss, S. I. Primitive Semitic Religion To-day. Chicago, 1902.

Lagrange, M. J. Études sur les Religions Sémitiques. Deuxième édition. Paris, 1905.

Saussaye, Ch. D. L. Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte. I. Tübingen, 1905.

Smith, W. Robertson. The Religion of the Semites. Second edition. London, 1894.

Winckler, Hugo. Religionsgeschichtlicher und geschichtlicher Orient. Leipzig, 1906.

WORKS ON INDIVIDUAL RELIGIONS

ASSYRIAN AND BABYLONIAN

Fossey, Ch. La Magie Assyrienne. Paris, 1903.

Jastrow, Morris, Jr. The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Boston, 1898.

Jastrow, Morris, Jr. Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens. Vom Verfasser revidierte und wesentlich erweiterte Uebersetzung. I. Giessen, 1905. II is appearing in parts.

Jeremias, A. Die Babylonisch-Assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode. Leipzig, 1897.

Jeremias, A. Hölle und Paradies bei den Babyloniern. Leipzig, 1899.

Jeremias, A. The Babylonian Conception of Heaven and Hell. London, 1902.

Jeremias, A. Monotheistische Strömungen innerhalb der Babylonischen Religion. Leipzig, 1904.

King, L. W. Babylonian Religion and Mythology. London, 1903.

Morgenstern, J. The Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion. Berlin, 1905.

Sayce, A. H. The Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Babylonians. Third edition. London, 1891.

Sayce, A. H. The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia. Edinburgh, 1902.

Schrank, W. Babylonische Sühnriten besonders mit Rücksicht auf Priester und Büsser. Leipzig, 1908.

Thompson, R. C. Semitic Magic. London, 1908.

Thompson, R. C. The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia. I and II. London, 1903-1904.

Weber, O. Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer. Ein Ueberblick. Leipzig, 1907.

HEBREW

Bennett, W. H. The Theology of the Old Testament. London, 1896.

Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York, 1904.

Dillmann, A. Handbuch der Alttestamentlichen Theologie. Leipzig, 1895.

Duff, A. The Theology and Ethics of the Hebrews. New York, 1902.

Kayser, A. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Zweite Auflage. Strassburg, 1894.

Marti, Karl. Die Religion des Alten Testament unter den Religionen des Vorderen Orients. Tübingen, 1906.

Marti, Karl. The Religion of the Old Testament. London, 1907.

Oehler, G. F. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Dritte Auflage. I and II. Stuttgart, 1891.

Oehler, G. F. Theology of the Old Testament. Second edition. I and II. Edinburgh, 1884.

Piepenbring, Ch. Theologie de l'Ancien Testament. Paris, 1886.

Piepenbring, Ch. Theology of the Old Testament. New York, 1893.

Riehm, Ed. Alttestamentliche Theologie. Halle, 1889.

Schultz, H. Alttestamentliche Theologie. Die Offenbarungsreligion auf ihrer vorchristlichen Entwickelungsstufe. Fünfte Auflage. Göttingen, 1896.

Schultz, H. Old Testament Theology. Translated from the Fourth German Edition by J. A. Paterson. I and II. Edinburgh, 1898.

Smend, R. Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte. Freiburg und Leipzig, 1893.

ARABIC

Weber, O. Arabien vor dem Islam. Leipzig, 1901.

Wellhausen, J. Reste Arabischen Heidentums gesammelt und erläutert. Zweite Auflage. Berlin, 1897.

COMPARATIVE WORKS

Baethgen, Fr. Beiträge zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte. Der Gott Israels und die Götter der Heiden. Berlin, 1888.

Hommel, Fritz. Der Gestirndienst der alten Araber und die altisraelitische Ueberlieferung. München, 1901.

Jeremias, A. Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients. Zweite Auflage. Leipzig, 1906.

Nielsen, D. Die altarabische Mondreligion und die mosaische Ueberlieferung. Strassburg, 1904.

Rogers, Robert W. The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, especially in its relations to Israel. New York, 1908.

Schrader, E. Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament. Dritte Auflage, neu bearbeitet von H. Zimmern und H. Winckler. Berlin, 1903. Cited as KAT.

Sellin, E. Der Ertrag der Ausgrabungen im Orient für die Erkenntnis der Entwicklung der Religion Israels. Leipzig, 1905.

Sellin, E. Die alttestamentliche Religion im Rahmen der andern altorientalischen. Leipzig, 1908.

Vigouroux, F. La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes en Palestine, en Égypte, et en Assyrie. Quatrième édition. I-IV. Paris, 1884-1885.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND NAMES

Abraham, 67.
Abyssinia, 18.
Adad, 44.
Adadnirari III, 45, 64, 66.
Adam, 25.
Adapa, 25.
Aksum, 18.
Allah, 94.
Allatu, 63, 167.
Altar, 100, 106 seq., 113f, 116, 118, 121f, 149, 160.
Alu, 180.
Amenhotep IV, 46.
Animism, 30f, 35, 37.
An-Shar, 59.
Anthropomorphism, 37 seq., 51, 127, 186.
Anu, 42, 59.
Anunnaki, 177.
Aralu: the Babylonian underworld, 63, 166 seq., 175 seq., 181; food and drink in, 176 seq.
Ashipu, 21.
Ashur, the Assyrian city, 42, 65, 101.
Ashur, the Assyrian god, 24, 42f, 55, 64 seq., 87.
Ashurbanipal, 19, 22 seq., 28.
Astrology, 23.
Aten, 46.
Atonement, 96, 107, 111, 116, 121, 128 seq., 161.
Atrahasis, 25.
Azazel, 134.

Babbar, 43.
Babylonian exile, 79, 133, 181, 189.
Baru, 21.
Bel, 42 seq., 59.
Bel-Marduk, 43.
Blood, of sacrifices, 102, 113, 117, 121f, 127, 129, 134, 136.
Bloodless offering, 105f, 110, 118f.
Book of the Covenant, 149.
Borrowing, of religious ideas, 29 seq., 188 seq.
Borsippa, 102.
Burial, 166, 175f, 178.
Burnt offering, 96, 101, 106 seq., 130, 135 seq.

Carthage, 25f, 104.
Cassites, 15.
Cave, as burial-place, 166.
Centralization, of worship, 52, 100f.
Ceremonial cleanness and uncleanness, 71 seq., 92, 95 seq., 131f, 200.
Chaldeans, 15.
Chronology, 28f.
City gods, 36, 42, 62.
City-State, 17.
Clan god (see tribal gods).
Clan sacrifice (see tribal sacrifices).
Common-Semitic ideas: 48, 61, 75, 89, 95, 98 seq., 185 seq., 199; origin of, 188 seq.

Confession, of sin, 21, 88.
Conquest, of Canaan by Hebrews, 190 seq.
Covenant, with Yahweh, 139f, 156, 158f.
Cradle, of the Semites, 13.
Creation: in Babylonian accounts, 23, 87; in the Old Testament, 87.
Creator: Babylonian gods as, 59, 87; Yahweh as, 58, 60, 87.
Cyprus, 25.
Cyrus, 15.

Daily sacrifice, 102, 138.
Damascus, 17.
Darkness, in underworld, 167, 169f, 179.
Death, 37, 60, 82, 89, 134, 139f, 142, 155, 174, 176f, 179.
Deification of king, 178.
Deluge: in Babylonian account, 24f; in Old Testament account, 25.
Demons: 20, 91 seq., 142 seq., 150, 171, 180; present in sickness, 92.
Denunciation, of sacrifice, 152 seq.
Distinctive Old Testament teachings: 98, 193 seq., 199; source of, 194 seq.
Dust, in underworld, 167.

E, Elohistic Code, 149.
Ea, 42, 44f, 59.
Education, 104.
Elamites, 15.
Enuma elish, 23, 87.
Epics, of the Babylonians, 20, 24f.
Eridu, 24, 87.
Esarhaddon, 22.
Eshmunazar, 73, 168.
Esoteric religious doctrine, 47.
Etana, 25.
Eternity, divine, 57 seq., 76, 188.
Ethical: character of religion, 50, 83f, 89f, 94f, 97f; completeness of deity, 49, 70, 74f, 78, 187, 194; divine character, 48 seq., 75, 83f, 97f, 187, 199f.
Ethiopic language, 18.
Expiation, of sin (see atonement).
Expulsion, from tribe, 139.
Ezekiel, book of, 152.

Faithfulness, divine, 75 seq., 80, 188.
Fall, of man, 88.
Fee, of priests, 123.
Firstfruits, 118.
Forgiveness, divine, 83f, 149, 159, 199.
Future life: 82, 99, 165 seq., 186, 190; rewards and punishments in, 175 seq., 186.

Gift, to deity, 107, 111 seq., 118, 124, 128, 146, 158.
Gilgamesh, 24, 175, 177.
Grace, divine, 83f.
Gradations, divine, 42 seq., 55.
Grave, 166, 168.
Guilt offering, 115f, 118f, 121f, 124, 130, 135 seq.

Hadad, 169.
Hadramaut, 17.
Hammurabi, 23, 25, 41, 49, 81.
Haupt, 109.
Heaven, 52, 56.
Heretic king, 46.
High places, 101.
Holiness, 70 seq., 94.
Holocaust, 108.
Home, of the Semites, 13.
Human sacrifice, 107, 113, 123, 135, 192.
Hymns, of the Babylonians, 20f, 143.

Ideographic writing, 31.
Idolatry, 106.
Images, divine, 54, 100.
Immoral gods, 75, 187.
Incantation, 64, 77, 82, 103, 126, 142 seq., 179, 187.
Incense offering, 117f.
Individual: in relation to deity, 77, 79f, 91; in relation to sacrifice, 101f, 112, 137f, 151.
Infinitude, divine, 57, 199.
Ira, 25.
Irkalla, 167.
Isaac, 134.
Ishtar, 75, 100, 167.

Jastrow, 31, 41, 167.
Jealousy, divine, 67.
Jerusalem, 100.
Jinns, 41, 84.
Job, 152.
Jonah, book of, 83.
Judgment, after death, 180.
Justice, divine, 38, 63, 78 seq.

Kalkhi, 64f.
Kataban, 17.
Ki-Shar, 59.
Knowledge, divine, 68f.
Kutha, 102.

Labartu, 20.
Lagash, 100.
Lagrange, 48.
Langdon, 109.
Levitical legislation, 98, 153.
Leviticus, book of, 147.
Libation, 110, 113, 117, 172.
Lifting of the hand, prayers of, 20.
Limitation, of the efficacy of sacrifice, 141, 147, 149, 153 seq., 185f.
Liver, in Babylonian divination, 22.
Local gods, 36, 42, 48, 62f, 64, 67f, 80, 100.
Love, divine, 48f, 83f, 188.

Magic, 77, 80, 82, 84, 126, 133, 142f, 145 seq., 178f, 194, 199f.
Majesty, divine, 57.
Maqlu, 20.
Marduk: of Babylon, 23f, 42 seq., 65, 87, 165; of Eridu, 24, 87.
Marseilles tablet, 25, 123.
Maspero, 45.
Mat, 180.
Mercy, divine, 83f, 149f, 155, 159.
Mesha, 26.
Messianic teaching, 165f, 187.
Migration: Arabic, 14; Aramaic, 14f; Babylonian, 14f; Canaanite, 14; Southern Arabic, 15.
Minæans, 17f, 102.
Moabite Stone, 26.
Monarchical tendency, among deities, 43, 48, 55.
Monolatry, 40.
Monotheism: 40 seq., 75, 194; ancient Oriental, 47; approximations to, 41 seq., 187.
Morgenstern, 90.
Muhammad, 27, 93f.
Muhammadanism, 50.
Myths, of the Babylonians, 20, 24f, 40, 62.

Nabu, 44f, 63 seq.
Nabuapaliddin, 124.
Name, of Yahweh, 40.
Nannar, 43.
National gods, 48, 55, 62, 68, 80.
National sacrifices, 101f, 137 seq., 151, 200.
Nations, in relation to Yahweh, 60, 79f, 83.
Nature gods, 38, 50 seq., 59, 75.

Nature of man, 87f.
Nazirite, 95f.
Nehemiah, 147.
Nergal, 44, 63, 167.
Nielsen, 48f, 75.
Nineveh, 16, 65, 102.
Ninib, 44.

Omens, Babylonian, 20 seq., 103.
Omnipotence, divine, 57, 60 seq., 188.
Omnipresence, divine, 57, 67f, 188.
Omniscience, divine, 57, 68f, 188.
Oracles, Babylonian, 22.
Osiris, 82, 169, 179f.

P, Priest Code, 123, 140, 147f.
Panammu, 169, 178.
Pantheism, 39, 45 seq., 55, 180.
Peace offering, 101, 106 seq., 137.
Personality, divine, 35, 38 seq., 48, 51, 53, 186.
Philosophical speculation, 39, 46.
Power, divine, 53, 55, 60 seq., 72.
Prayers: Babylonian, 20f, 84, 88, 143, 146; Egyptian, 179.
Priestess, 22.
Priestly legislation (see Levitical legislation).
Priests, 22, 96, 102 seq., 108f, 111, 116, 118 seq., 121 seq., 130, 171.
Prostitution, 71, 75, 199.
Psalms: Babylonian, 20f, 143; Babylonian penitential, 21, 69, 88.
Punishment, divine, 76f, 79f, 89, 91f, 96, 140f, 144, 149f, 155, 173 seq.

Ra, 169, 178f.
Rebellion, against God, 140.
Redemption, 99.
Religious literature: Arabic, 27; Aramaic, 26f; Assyrian, 19f; Babylonian, 19 seq.; Hebrew, 26; Moabite, 26; Phœnician, 25; Southern Arabic, 27; Syriac, 27.
Reparation, with guilt offering, 136.
Repentance, 155 seq.
Resurrection, 181f, 186.
Revelation: 195 seq.,; progress of, 198f, 201.
Righteousness, divine, 49, 72, 74, 78, 188.

Sabæans, 17f.
Sacrifice: 22, 40, 53, 77, 88f, 93, 99 seq., 143, 146 seq., 172, 185, 187, 189 seq., 199f; as *opus operatum*, 148; different kinds of, 106 seq.; materials of, 104 seq.; meaning of, 106, 125 seq.; place of, 100f; time of, 100 seq.
Sacrificial meal, 106, 111, 114, 123, 137.
Sacrificial regulations, 119 seq.
Salvation, 99 seq., 185, 187, 194.
Samuel, 172.
Sayce, 30f, 66, 180.
Schrank, 131.
Shalmaneser II, 64, 66, 81.
Shamash, 22, 29, 38, 43f, 63, 66, 78, 81f.
Sheol, 67, 169 seq., 180f.
Showbread, 119.
Shukamuna, 44.
Shurpu, 20, 90.
Sidon, 168.
Sin, 21, 69, 71, 79, 83, 87 seq., 99, 107, 113, 128, 130, 132, 135 seq., 144, 146, 154 seq., 173, 186, 189, 199f.

Sin offering, 96, 115f, 118 seq., 124, 130, 134 seq., 137, 140, 158.
Sin, the Babylonian god, 43f.
Sins: done unwittingly, 140, 147 seq.; of deliberate purpose, 140, 147 seq.
Sippar, 102.
Smith, 93, 111, 115.
Solomon, 52.
Spheres, of divine activity, 63f.
Spirituality, divine, 35, 51 seq., 127, 187, 194, 199f.
Substitutionary idea, in sacrifice, 114, 133 seq.
Sukh, 44.
Sumerians, 15, 30f.
Sumero-Akkadian literature, 31.
Superstition, 45.
Syncretism, religious, 43, 48.

Tabnith, 168.
Temple: 21, 100, 143; in Old Testament, 52, 100, 159.
Thank offering, 152.
Theophanies, of Yahweh, 52.
Tiamat, 24.
Tiglathpileser III, 17, 66.
Totemism, 37, 112, 114.
Transcendence, divine, 39, 55f.
Triad, divine, 59.
Tribal gods, 91, 94, 111, 137, 140.
Tribal sacrifices, 111 seq., 137 seq.

Unity, divine, 35, 40 seq., 187, 194, 199.
Universality, of sin, 88.
Ur, 67.
Ushebtis, 180.
Utnapishtim, 24f.
Utukki limnuti, 20.

Votive inscriptions, 27.

Wellhausen, 94.
Winckler, 14, 193.
Witches, 92f, 133.
Worship: astral, 36, 48, 50; of ancestors, 37; of natural phenomena, 36.

Zamama, 44.
Zammaru, 21.
Zenjirli, 26.
Zu, 25.

INDEX OF OLD TESTAMENT REFERENCES

	PAGE
Genesis 8 : 20	127
Genesis 28 : 15	67
Exodus 15 : 18	58
Exodus 21 : 14	149
Exodus 32	149f
Leviticus 2 : 11	106
Leviticus 3 : 17	106
Leviticus 12 : 6, 8	96
Leviticus 14 : 19	96
Leviticus 15 : 15	96
Leviticus 16 : 21, 26, 28	134
Leviticus 17 : 11, 121,	129
Numbers 6 : 9-11	95
Numbers 6 : 11, 14	96
Numbers 15	149
Numbers 15 : 22-31	147
Numbers 15 : 27-31	140
Numbers 15 : 30, 140f,	150
Numbers 15 : 32-36	150
Numbers 19 : 13, 20	96
Numbers 25	150
Deuteronomy 18	145
Deuteronomy 18 : 12, 14	145
1 Samuel 2 : 6	171
1 Samuel 21 : 5	72
1 Samuel 28 : 8-19	172
2 Samuel 12 : 23	170
1 Kings 8 : 27	52
Job 1 : 5	152
Job 7 : 9f	170
Job 10 : 21f	169
Job 16 : 22	170
Job 19 : 25-27	181
Job 42 : 8	152

	PAGE
Psalm 6 : 5	171
Psalm 10 : 16	58
Psalm 16	181
Psalm 20 : 3	152
Psalm 24 : 3-6	159
Psalm 26 : 6	160
Psalm 40 : 6-8	158
Psalm 49	181
Psalm 50 : 5, 8-14, 16-21	158
Psalm 50 : 12f	127
Psalm 51 : 16, 17	157
Psalm 51 : 19	151
Psalm 54 : 6	151
Psalm 56 : 12	151
Psalm 65 : 3	159
Psalm 66 : 13, 15	151
Psalm 73	181
Psalm 78 : 38	159
Psalm 79 : 9	159
Psalm 85 : 2	159
Psalm 96 : 8	151
Psalm 103 : 17	58
Psalm 107 : 22	151
Psalm 115 : 17	171
Psalm 116 : 17	151
Psalm 118 : 27	151
Psalm 139 : 5-10	67
Psalm 139 : 8	171
Proverbs 7 : 14	151
Proverbs 11 : 7	181
Proverbs 14 : 32	181
Proverbs 15 : 8	154
Proverbs 17 : 1	151
Proverbs 21 : 3	157

	PAGE
Proverbs 21 : 27	154
Ecclesiastes 9 : 2	152
Ecclesiastes 9 : 5f, 10	170
Isaiah 1 : 11-17	156
Isaiah 1 : 16	96
Isaiah 1 : 18-20	157
Isaiah 2 : 19, 21	79
Isaiah 3 : 13	79
Isaiah 6 : 5	96
Isaiah 10 : 23	79
Isaiah 14 : 26	79
Isaiah 19 : 21	151, 153
Isaiah 26 : 19	182
Isaiah 28 : 22	79
Isaiah 33 : 14-16	159
Isaiah 38 : 17	159
Isaiah 40	60
Isaiah 41 : 4	58
Isaiah 43 : 2	67
Isaiah 43 : 10	58
Isaiah 43 : 13	60
Isaiah 43 : 23f	151
Isaiah 44 : 6	58
Isaiah 44 : 22	159
Isaiah 45 : 9	60
Isaiah 48 : 12	58
Isaiah 51 : 6	58
Isaiah 56 : 7	151
Isaiah 66 : 3f	154
Jeremiah 6 : 20	154
Jeremiah 7 : 22	191
Jeremiah 17 : 26	151, 153
Jeremiah 18	61
Jeremiah 23 : 9	73
Jeremiah 23 : 23f	67
Jeremiah 31 : 29, 30	80
Jeremiah 33 : 8	96
Jeremiah 33 : 11	151, 153
Jeremiah 33 : 18	151, 153
Jeremiah 50	72
Jeremiah 51	72
Lamentations 4 : 14f	96
Ezekiel 18	80
Ezekiel 20 : 40	151
Ezekiel 37	181
Daniel 9 : 27	151
Daniel 12 : 2	182
Hosea 3 : 4	151, 153
Hosea 4 : 13f, 19	154
Hosea 6 : 6	156
Hosea 8 : 13	154
Hosea 9 : 4	151, 153
Joel 1 : 9, 13	151
Joel 2 : 14	151
Amos 3 : 2	79
Amos 4 : 4f	154
Amos 5 : 14f	156
Amos 5 : 16-20	155
Amos 5 : 22-24	155
Amos 5 : 24	156
Amos 5 : 25	155, 191
Amos 9 : 2-4	67
Amos 9 : 7	60f
Micah 3	157
Micah 6 : 6-8	157
Micah 7 : 19	159
Malachi 1 : 7-10	151
Malachi 3 : 3f	151

Personality
Unity
Spirituality 51
Individuality 104
Kinds of Sacrifice 106
Meaning of Blood 121
Substitution 134

Date Loaned
21/44
DATE DUE

,542

BS 1180 .B3779 1910

Berry, George Ricker, 1865-

The Old Testament among the Semitic religions

DENEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS1180.B3779 1910
Berry, George The Old Testament among th
3 0645 0002 7784 4